

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

PRR

JUN 19 1956

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

VOL. LXXVII, 2

WHOLE No. 306

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by
HENRY T. ROWELL

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN, KEMP MALONE
BENJAMIN D. MERITT, JAMES H. OLIVER
EVELYN H. CLIFT: Secretary

Honorary Editor
DAVID M. ROBINSON

APRIL, 1956

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Senatorial Opposition to Claudius and Nero. By D. McALINDON, -	113
The Date of the <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> of Sophocles. By BERNARD M. W. KNOX, - - - - -	133
Horace, the Unwilling Warrior: <i>Satire</i> I, 9. By WILLIAM S. ANDERSON, - - - - -	148
Demonax, <i>Βασιλεὺς Μαντινέων</i> . By A. A. I. WAISGLASS, - - -	167
The Two Boar-Sacrifices in the Iguvine Tables. By JAMES W. POULTNEY, - - - - -	177
Goodwin or Gildersleeve? By ALICE F. BRAUNLICH, - - -	181
REVIEWS: - - - - -	185
<i>Bagnani's</i> Arbiter of Elegance, A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius (HENRY T. ROWELL).—Martin's T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex, 2nd ed. (J. P. ELDER).— <i>Pohlens'</i> Die griechische Tragödie. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage. Vol. I: Textband; Vol. II: Erläuterungsband (RICHMOND LATTIMORE).—Chamoux's Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades (CARL ROEBUCK).—Martin's Papyrus Bodmer, I: Iliade, Chants 5 et 6 (GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING).—Caplan's [Cicero] Ad C. Herennium De Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica Ad Herennium) with an English Translation (HARRY M. HUBBELL).—Koerte's Menandri Quae Supersunt. Pars Altera: Reliquiae apud Veteres Scriptores Servatae. Opus postumum retractavit, addenda ad utramque partem adiecit A. Thierfelder (L. A. POST).—Aymard and Auboyer's Rome et son Empire (CHESTER G. STARR).—Dale's The Plays of Euripides: Alceste. Edited with Introduction and Commentary (CHARLES T. MURPHY).—Uhlfelder's De Proprietate Sermonum vel Rerum. A Study and Critical Edition of a Set of Verbal Distinctions (DOROTHY M. SCHULLIAN).—Caes and Henrion's Collectio Bibliographica Operum ad Ius Romanum Pertinentium: Series Prima, Opera in periodicis miscellaneis encyclopaediisque edita, vols. 1, 2-3, 4-5; Series Secunda, Theses, Vol. 1: Theses Galliae (J. H. OLIVER).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	223

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$6.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 50 cents, Canadian postage 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$2.00 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Henry T. Rowell, The Johns Hopkins University; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXXVII, 2

WHOLE No. 306

SENATORIAL OPPOSITION TO CLAUDIUS AND NERO.

A friend of the Younger Pliny, C. Fannius, wrote three books describing the *exitus occisorum aut relegatorum a Nerone*.¹ If, as is most likely, he was related to Fannia,² daughter of Thrasea Paetus, then he was linked appropriately with a tradition of anti-imperial feeling lasting from the reign of Claudius till that of Domitian. Under Claudius, C. Caecina Paetus, as a result of the part he took in the revolt of Scribonianus, was condemned and committed suicide with his wife.³ Their daughter Arria⁴ was married to Thrasea, who was condemned in 66.⁵ Thrasea's daughter,⁶ in turn, was the wife of another philosopher, Helvidius Priscus,⁷ who was deported by Nero and Vespasian, and killed under the latter emperor.⁸ Both Arria and Fannia were banished in the reign of Domitian,⁹ when the son of Helvidius by an earlier marriage was condemned to death for *maiestas*.¹⁰ The connection between intermarriage and anti-imperial feeling does not end here. The wife of the younger Helvidius was called Anteia;¹¹ of the three Antei we know after the reign of

¹ Plin., *Ep.*, 5, 5.

² *P. I. R.*², F 118. The relationship is suggested by Stein, *P. I. R.*², F 116.

³ *Ibid.*, C 103.

⁴ *Ibid.*, A 1114.

⁵ *Ibid.*, C 1187.

⁶ *Ibid.*, F 118.

⁷ *P. I. R.*, H 37.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *P. I. R.*², A 1114.

¹⁰ *P. I. R.*, H 38.

¹¹ *P. I. R.*², A 732.

Tiberius, one was killed after being exiled by Gaius, another as a result of that emperor's murder, and the third committed suicide in 66, being accused of *maiestas*.¹² Lastly, a P. Helvidius Priscus,¹³ probably an uncle¹⁴ of the younger Helvidius, was the husband of Plautia Quinctilia, with whom it is natural to link either Plautius Lateranus, expelled from the senate in 48, and executed for conspiracy in 65,¹⁵ or the young Plautius who suffered the same fate under Nero.¹⁶

An examination of the career and background of those executed or banished under Claudius and Nero, showing a high incidence of casualties within certain families, or groups of families, as in the case already considered, tends to throw some light on the confused cause/effect relationship between hereditary senatorial resistance and imperial persecution, and to dispel certain superficial notions regarding the unity and distribution of senatorial opposition. The position into which emperors were forced by family pride and resentment, leading both to imperial aspirations and stubborn philosophic resistance, can thus be better understood in the absence of unbiassed sources, and many condemnations, attributed to a multitude of causes, appear, when seen in their context, to have been at least understandable precautions and sometimes justifiable measures against treason, committed or contemplated. This is especially the case in the reign of Claudius; as a result of provocation on the part of his successor, the traditional opposition was joined in the next reign even by some members of hitherto loyal families.

The sources state that thirty-five senators were put to death by Claudius.¹⁷ There is no reason for rejecting this allegation, especially since Suetonius and Seneca are in agreement about the numbers of senators killed, but not regarding the equestrian casualties.¹⁸ We know the names of eighteen senators whose deaths were due to political charges or alleged imperial in-

¹² *Ibid.*, A 728, 729 (his son), and 731.

¹³ *P. I. R.*, H 41.

¹⁴ The possibility that this was Helvidius the Elder is dismissed by Gaheis, *R.-E.*, VIII, col. 222, no. 5.

¹⁵ *P. I. R.*, P 354.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, P 345; *R.-E.*, XXI, col. 29, no. 40; cf. no. 48.

¹⁷ Suet., *Claud.*, 29; Sen., *Apocol.*, 13.

¹⁸ Over 300 (Suet.) and 221 (Sen.).

trigue;¹⁹ along with these, within the senatorial order, but not strictly *senatores*, were the wives of two of the foregoing, and five other women;²⁰ also to be considered are the "many" accomplices of Scribonianus²¹ and others whose names might have been known had the account of Tacitus been complete. When we find that in the first seventeen years of Tiberius' reign—four years more than the total reign of Claudius—not one senator had been sentenced to death,²² the figures for the later period are surprising. They are even more so when we take into account the ample evidence of Claudius' respect for, and attempts to placate the senate. His desire to appear as one of their body is frequently illustrated by the sources,²³ as is his respect for magistrates, and consideration for individual members.²⁴ He sought to convert to healthy criticism in the senate the underground hostility of some senators and the servility of almost all.²⁵ His campaign to increase the dignity of the senate²⁶ and the *maiestas huius ordinis* which he speaks of²⁷ was no more severe than the many regulations imposed by Augustus. His clemency was such as to remove all but the most obdurate prejudice regarding his attitude to the senate. He pardoned and gave office and honours to those who had hoped for a republican restoration or had themselves aspired to

¹⁹ *P. I. R.*², A 701, 1140, 1225, C 103, 1400; *P. I. R.*, I 462, 541, 559, L 130, 327, P 109, 477, 481, 564, S 505, 618, V 25, 445.

²⁰ *P. I. R.*², A 1113, *P. I. R.*, S 221 (and Sen., *Apocol.*, 11); *P. I. R.*², D 180, *P. I. R.*, I 422, 444, L 242, V 161. This possible extension of the word *senatores* might conceivably be deduced from the elasticity of the term *ordo*: cf. its use by Tac., *Ann.*, XIII, 25 with that in the speech of Claudius, Charlesworth, *Documents*, no. 3, p. 7.

²¹ Dio, LX, 15, 3, 6.

²² Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus*, Appendix II.

²³ Dio, LX, 6, 1, 3; 11, 6-7; 12, 5; Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 27, 7; Suet., *Claud.*, 12, 1-3; 36.

²⁴ Dio, LX, 6, 1; 7, 4; 12, 2-3; Suet., *Claud.*, 12, 1-2.

²⁵ Cf. his criticism of the consul Vipstanus (Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 25, 7) and his favourable reception of the speech of Domitius Afer whom he proposed to remove from the senate (Hieronym., *Epist.*, 52, 7, 3; *P. I. R.*², D 126).

²⁶ Dio, LX, 11, 6, 8; 25, 6; 29, 1-2; Suet., *Claud.*, 24, 1; 23, 2 (cf. Suidas, s. v. Κλαύδιος); Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 25.

²⁷ *B. G. U.*, no. 611 = Charlesworth, *Documents*, 3, col. 3.

the throne.²⁸ The sons of those who participated in the revolt of Scribonianus, unlike the sons of many conspirators under Nero,²⁹ received immunity and sometimes money gifts. The sons of Valerius Asiaticus and Scribonianus both became senators after their parents' deaths.³⁰

Nec tamen, as Suetonius says after describing Claudius' efforts to obtain popularity,³¹ *expers insidiarum usque quaque permansit; sed et a singulis et per factionem et denique civili bello infestatus est*. This sentence alone would suffice to account for the number of senatorial casualties; but the impression given by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio in their accounts of individual cases is that most of the condemnations were unjustified and often due to the emperor's wives and freedmen. In assessing the relative worth of the two traditions, it is in the latter case, since senatorial prejudice is involved, that one may well ask "Quis unquam ab historico iuratores exegit?"³² That it is distorted is generally accepted.³³ It was probably coloured by literary accounts of the deaths of famous men,³⁴ and the nature of accusations in the empire was such that a historian could, if he wished, be selective.³⁵ A good example is the case of L. Silanus.³⁶ Tacitus mentions only a charge of incest. Neither Suetonius nor Dio refers to this, however, though its authenticity is almost certain in view of the expiatory rites in Tacitus; on the other hand Dio mentions only the charge of plotting against the emperor.³⁷ A common premiss of senatorial his-

²⁸ Dio, LX, 3, 5-7; 4, 1-2; Suet., *Claud.*, 11, 1; 17, 3. Cf. Sen., *Ad Polyb.*, 13, 4.

²⁹ Suet., *Nero*, 36, 2.

³⁰ Dio, LX, 16, 2; *P. I. R.*², A 1147, *P. I. R.*, V 26. The son of Asiaticus may have entered the *cursus honorum* under Nero.

³¹ Suet., *Claud.*, 11, 1.

³² Sen., *Apocol.*, 1.

³³ See Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius*, ch. 1; Walker, *op. cit.*, ch. 6.

³⁴ See Marx, "Tacitus und die Literatur der exitus illustrium viro-
rum," *Philol.*, XCII (1937), pp. 83-103.

³⁵ Cf. Quint., III, 10, 1: *Una controversia est per se furti, per se adulterii. Plures aut eiusdem generis, ut in pecuniis repetundis, aut diversi, ut si quis sacrilegii et homicidii simul accusetur. Quod nunc in publicis iudiciis non accidit . . . principum autem et senatus cognitionibus frequens est. . . .*

³⁶ *P. I. R.*, I 559.

³⁷ Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 4, 8; Dio, LX, 31, 8 (Epit.); Suet., *Claud.*, 29, 1-2.

torians seems to have been that the charge of treason, or at some periods of *maiestas*, which was often included in a complex indictment was to be regarded as false unless it was corroborated by rebellion or attempted assassination. Tacitus in this case chose to use the plausible tradition that Agrippina was responsible for laying false accusations against Silanus, agreeing to this extent only with Dio. The *Apocolocyntosis*, however, which implies that Silanus was guilty of incest, and Seneca's introduction of the subject seem to show that there was no embarrassment to Agrippina, while in the *Octavia* Silanus is regarded as innocent and referred to as *criminis ficti reus*.³⁸

Regarding the influence of the emperor's wives in general, while there must undoubtedly have been some foundation for this as for the other traditions connected with this reign, several arguments indicate that their influence was considerably exaggerated. Modern ideas of Claudius tend to picture him as a figure of amazing industry and scrupulous concern in all that pertained to his office. That he could be cajoled into permitting the deaths of innocent men seems unlikely in view of his fixed policy of reconciliation; that he could be hoodwinked by his wives appears equally improbable in one so interested in every sphere of administrative activity, especially that of a judicial nature.³⁹ Two important cases, those of Valerius Asiaticus and T. Statilius Taurus, where the instigators were Messalina and Agrippina respectively, both covetous of the gardens of the accused, have been considered by Scramuzza and are good examples of the weakness of tradition.⁴⁰ In the case of Appius Silanus, executed in 42, the sources may be similarly doubted. It is hard to believe that Claudius, at this early stage, when the outstanding feature of his policy was extreme caution and clemency, would have permitted the death of a prominent senator against whom "no true or credible charge"⁴¹ was possible; the suggestion that his death was due to his refusal to lie with

³⁸ *Octavia*, 149. Sen., *Apocol.*, 8; Miss Marti, *A. J. P.*, LXXIV (1953), pp. 24-36, revives the view that Seneca wrote the *Octavia*.

³⁹ Sen., *Apocol.*, 7; Plin., *Ep.*, 1, 13, 3.

⁴⁰ Scramuzza, pp. 93-8. The suggestion that Asiaticus was actually guilty of conspiracy was already made by Cahuzac, *Décadence du sénat romain* (Diss. Poitiers, 1846), p. 72.

⁴¹ Dio, LX, 14, 4.

Messalina,⁴² then aged about twenty,⁴³ and involved Narcissus, who was later the cause of her condemnation,⁴⁴ in a scheme which might have cost him his life, seems less likely than that Silanus, a member of a family whose record, as will be seen, was one of constant conflict with the emperors, was condemned not on the evidence of dreams,⁴⁵ but of actual conspiracy. The charge of *maiestas* had actually been laid against him in 32.⁴⁶

Claudius had been independent enough to divorce his first two wives and permitted the death of Messalina, his third.⁴⁷ He had rejected the title "Augusta" offered to Messalina by the senate.⁴⁸ Agrippina could not save from condemnation by a servile senate her agent Tarquinius Priscus.⁴⁹ In the case of the freedmen, who are not concerned independently in the prosecution of senators, "the fact that Claudius was the organiser of this ministry is proof enough that his personality dominated it."⁵⁰ This view is confirmed by his condemnation of five freedmen of sufficient importance to have their names recorded by Seneca.⁵¹

A most significant fact is that in the *Apocolocyntosis* Claudius is held fully accountable for his "attack on the senate."⁵² There is no suggestion that any senator fell victim to either the freedmen or the emperor's wives, though it is only in the case of Agrippina that such silence might be expected; Narcissus is mentioned as having ordered the execution of Silius and his collaborators, but they are introduced to accuse Claudius, against whom they had formed a genuine plot. The peculiarities of the emperor⁵³ are not regarded by Seneca as incompatible with the guilt of condemning so many. Mention of the responsibility

⁴² *Ibid.*, 14, 3.

⁴³ Scramuzza, p. 90.

⁴⁴ Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 29-37; Dio, LX, 31, 4-5 (Epit.); Juv., 14, 330-1.

⁴⁵ Dio, LX, 14, 4.

⁴⁶ Tac., *Ann.*, VI, 9.

⁴⁷ Suet., *Claud.*, 26, 2; Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 37-8.

⁴⁸ Dio, LX, 12, 5.

⁴⁹ Tac., *Ann.*, XIV, 46; C. A. H., X, p. 698.

⁵⁰ Momigliano, *Claudius the Emperor and his Achievement*, p. 43; Sherwin-White, *P. B. S. R.*, 1939, p. 14, also suggests that the influence of the freedmen is overestimated; Scramuzza, p. 87.

⁵¹ Sen., *Apocol.*, 13.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 8; 10.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 1; 4; 5; 6.

of the senate, which participated in most of the condemnations, is diplomatically avoided by him;⁵⁴ this omission may be a symptom of the senatorial guilt complex that is to be found in later tradition, in the form of exaggerated denunciations of the emperors, their households and their regimes, relating much of doubtful authenticity, and obscuring what was discordant with the spirit of *illustrium virorum* history, namely the part played by the senate in condemnations, and the acts which led to the condemnation of individual senators.

If one accepts the premiss that the casualties of the reign of Claudius were, to a less extent than the sources would have us believe, due to the emperor's wives and freedmen, then the statement of Suetonius⁵⁵ becomes correspondingly more intelligible, and a less conflicting picture of the emperor emerges. In harmony with this is the hypothesis that Claudius was forced by the inherited aspirations or grudges and consequent active or passive resistance of certain groups within the senate, to secure his survival by extreme measures opposed to the policy which had been his ideal. It remains, therefore, to examine the background and history of some of these families.

Two main characteristics appear, relationship to the imperial house, and that of *paternum in principes odium*. That the former may have been as much a cause for imperial suspicion as for aspirations to the throne on the part of those who could claim it seems, superficially at least, quite likely. But the general attitude of Claudius, his many concessions to those who were later condemned, and the individual circumstances in many cases, suggest that the emperor had sometimes no choice but to take action.

The history of the Iunii Silani was one of frequent conflict with the emperors, and of such continuity that it would be difficult to show the responsibility for it to have been entirely

⁵⁴ Despite the insinuation of Nero's speech (Tac., *Ann.*, XIII, 4, 2) there is little evidence of trials held *intra cubiculum principis* except in the case of Valerius Asiaticus (*Ann.*, XI, 2) and possibly that of Appius Silanus (Dio, LX, 14, 3; Suet., *Claud.*, 37). Nero maintained also, at a time when he would not have contradicted common knowledge, that Claudius did not order the accusations initiated by Suillius (Tac., *Ann.*, XIII, 43, 4). The allegations of Suillius to clear himself at the time of his trial may have been significant in forming later tradition.

⁵⁵ See above, n. 31.

on the side of the emperors. In 22 C. Iunius Silanus was relegated to an island on charges of extortion and *maiestas* after having been proconsul in Asia.⁵⁶ D. Silanus, probably a brother of the foregoing⁵⁷ was required by Tiberius not to seek office on his return from exile as a result of adultery with Julia. M. Silanus (cos. 15), his brother, was driven to suicide by Caligula, who had married his daughter.⁵⁸ Dio regarded his suicide as performed voluntarily to escape the insults of the emperor.⁵⁹ Suetonius says that he was driven to it for a specific reason.⁶⁰ Probably a son of M. Silanus (cos. 15), and therefore brother-in-law of Caligula, was the earlier-mentioned C. Appius Silanus⁶¹ who was executed in 42 by Claudius.⁶² He was the husband of Domitia Lepida, the aunt of Nero, who suffered, in 54, the same fate as her daughter by one marriage, her son by another, her husband in a third, and probably her sister.⁶³ Iunia Silana who was exiled in 55, was most likely a sister of Appius Silanus.⁶⁴

Just as in the case of M. Silanus, who was denied by the emperor the privilege of voting first among the ex-consuls,⁶⁵ so the prestige of another M. Silanus (cos. 19) prompted imperial action in the transference of the legion in Africa during his proconsulship to the command of a legate.⁶⁶ The nobility of this branch of the family was enhanced by his marriage to Aemilia Lepida, a great-granddaughter of Augustus,⁶⁷ whose father had been condemned for conspiracy against Augustus⁶⁸ and whose mother had died in exile.⁶⁹ Their children were

⁵⁶ *P. I. R.*, I 545.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, I 546.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, I 551.

⁵⁹ Dio, LIX, 8, 4.

⁶⁰ Suet., *Calig.*, 23, 3.

⁶¹ *P. I. R.*, I 541.

⁶² See n. 54.

⁶³ *P. I. R.*², D 180.

⁶⁴ *P. I. R.*, I 577; Dessau, *P. I. R.*, s. v., suggests that their father was M. Silanus (cos. 15) = *P. I. R.*, I 551.

⁶⁵ Dio, LIX, 8, 6.

⁶⁶ *P. I. R.*, I 552; Tac., *Hist.*, IV, 48.

⁶⁷ *P. I. R.*², A 419.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, A 391.

⁶⁹ *P. I. R.*, I 421. She had once been betrothed to Claudius who repudiated her because of her parents (Suet., *Claud.*, 26, 1). Her first cousin

Marcus, born in the same year as his great-great-grandfather, Augustus, died,⁷⁰ Decimus, and Lucius Silanus.⁷¹ The son of the Cn. Cornelius Gaetulicus who had revolted unsuccessfully under Caligula was probably related to them by adoption.⁷² A partner of Gaetulicus in his conspiracy had been M. Aemilius Lepidus, most likely a cousin of their mother, by whose death it is presumed that the long-famous Aemilia gens became extinct,⁷³ and their glories passed to increase the proud heritage and hopes of the Silani. Decimus and the son of Marcus took the "cognomen" of Torquatus, in reference to an adoption in their early history, and it was most likely one of this family who, under Caligula, was forbidden to use as his emblem the *torques*.⁷⁴ Claudius, in a manner consonant with his whole policy at this time, attempted to gain the favour of this noble family by betrothing Lucius Silanus to his daughter Octavia and granting him many privileges.⁷⁵ The confused nature of the evidence regarding his condemnation has already been mentioned. Three causes are recorded, the intention of Agrippina to obtain Octavia as a wife for her son Nero, the charge of incest, and that of plotting against the emperor.⁷⁶ Regarding the first it must be remembered that Silanus was not yet married to Octavia, so a less perilous course of action must have been open to Agrippina than that of wrecking the plans of

of the same name had committed suicide in 36 (*P. I. R.*², A 421), while a third Aemilia Lepida (*ibid.*, 420), less closely related, and her husband (*ibid.*, 404) had each been accused under Tiberius on charges of adultery and *maiestas*; the former was banished, the latter anticipated his condemnation by committing suicide.

⁷⁰ *P. I. R.*, I 553.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, I 558, 559; Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, p. 495.

⁷² *P. I. R.*, I 556 and Mommsen, *Eph. Epig.*, p. 201; it is probable that the wife of C. Calvisius Sabinus, who committed suicide in 39 with her husband, was his aunt (see *P. I. R.*², C 354 and 1479). Sabinus in turn was connected with Marcellus Aeserninus (*ibid.*, C 928) who, as J. H. Oliver has shown (*A. J. P.*, LXVIII [1947], pp. 150-8), was probably condemned by Tiberius.

⁷³ *P. I. R.*², A 371; Syme, p. 494.

⁷⁴ Cicero, *De Fin.*, I, 7, 23-4; Suet., *Calig.*, 35; it could also have been one of the gens Manlia or Nonia (Asprenas).

⁷⁵ Dio, LX, 5, 7; 21, 5; 23, 1; see Suet., *Claud.*, 24, 3; Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 3.

⁷⁶ Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 4, 8, 9; Sen. *Apocol.*, 8; Dio, LX, 31, 8.

Claudius who was not yet her husband;⁷⁷ the incest charge may have been justified, but since Claudius was also about to contract an incestuous marriage with his niece, it would not be unnatural to suppose in view of the background of the accused that the charge of plotting mentioned by Dio was also necessary to warrant his condemnation.⁷⁸ His sister was merely banished.⁷⁹ In 54, Marcus, the eldest brother,⁸⁰ was proconsul of Asia, where great excitement had been caused in 31 A.D. by an alleged son of M. Silanus, posing as Drusus.⁸¹ He was poisoned there.⁸² If as is likely enough, Agrippina, now at the height of her power, was responsible for this, it was still an indication that she regarded him as a potential threat to her son's position.

In 64 occurred the accusation and death of the third brother, Decimus,⁸³ whose prodigality, in the account of Dio,⁸⁴ was the cause of his downfall, but was only one of the charges which the accusers were ordered to make, according to Tacitus.⁸⁵ The distorted version of Dio omits mention of the family pride of the accused, and the fact that his prodigality was obnoxious to a spendthrift emperor only because it was spent on bribes and in patterning his household on that of Nero himself.⁸⁶ Silanus committed suicide before judgment could be passed,⁸⁷ a premature anticipation of the verdict for one who was innocent, especially since not one senator had been condemned to death by the senate till then.

Iunia Lepida⁸⁸ was a sister of the three Silani, and wife of Cassius Longinus, the celebrated *iuris consultus*.⁸⁹ Her nephew (son of the poisoned governor of Asia), together with her hus-

⁷⁷ Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 8, 1.

⁷⁸ Tacitus (*Ann.*, XII, 8) regards his suicide, it would seem, as an anticipation of condemnation; Suetonius and Dio treat it as tantamount to execution.

⁷⁹ Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 8, 1.

⁸⁰ *P. I. R.*, I 553.

⁸¹ Tac., *Ann.*, V, 10 (VI, 5).

⁸² *Ibid.*, XIII, 1, 33.

⁸³ *P. I. R.*, I 558.

⁸⁴ Dio, LX, 27, 2 = Exc. Val. 249 (p. 690).

⁸⁵ Tac., *Ann.*, XV, 35.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ *P. I. R.*, I 575.

⁸⁹ *P. I. R.*², C 503.

band, was accused in 65 of intentions similar to those of Decimus, his uncle, and in the view of Tacitus equally false.⁹⁰ Yet the same writer attributed the rejection by Calpurnius Piso of a certain course of action involving Nero's assassination as due to his fear of Silanus as a rival.⁹¹ Silanus, and Cassius, who had already been imprisoned under Gaius, were exiled, and the former subsequently was killed by a centurion.⁹² Iunia Lepida was at the same time accused of incest and the senate asked Nero to decide in her case.⁹³ The result is unknown, but her name does not recur in the history of the period. It was later proposed in the senate that the name of the month of June be changed in view of the recent history of the families which bore this name.⁹⁴

C. Silius,⁹⁵ a patrician like the Silani, had been married to Iunia Silana before his affair with Messalina which led to his execution while still consul designate.⁹⁶ It would seem that in his case, as in that of L. Silanus, family grievances and his own nobility prompted him to reject the favour he had found with Claudius and to seek to take his place. His father had been accused of extortion by Seianus and had anticipated his imminent condemnation by committing suicide in circumstances which, according to Tacitus, savoured of a *maiestas* trial. Velleius saw fit to comment on the ingratitude towards Tiberius of the elder Silius and of Piso (see *infra*) *quorum alterius dignitatem constituit, auxit alterius*.⁹⁷ Sosia, the wife of Silius, had been exiled soon afterwards.⁹⁸

Even in the cases of those of the Julio-Claudian line who perished in these reigns the common motive of the emperors—to consolidate their position by getting rid of those with rival claims to relationship with Augustus—seems in certain cases to be accompanied by some measure of justification. The deaths

⁹⁰ *P. I. R.*, I 560; Tac., *Ann.*, XVI, 8, 9.

⁹¹ Tac., *Ann.*, XV, 52, 3.

⁹² *Ibid.*, XVI, 9; Suet., *Nero*, 37, 1 and Dio, LXII, 27, 1 imply wrongly that Cassius was also executed.

⁹³ Tac., *Ann.*, XVI, 8, 2.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, XVI, 12, 3.

⁹⁵ *P. I. R.*, S 505.

⁹⁶ Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 30-8; Sen., *Apocol.*, 13.

⁹⁷ Tac., *Ann.*, IV, 18-19; Vell., II, 130.

⁹⁸ Tac., *Ann.*, IV, 20, 2.

of the two Julias, nieces of Claudius, were attributed (except by Seneca) to charges concocted by Messalina.⁹⁹ In the case of Julia, the daughter of Drusus, the details of her accusation by Suillius are not known. She had lost her father, her mother, and her first husband as a result of political intrigue or condemnations.¹⁰⁰ The daughter of Germanicus, Julia Livilla,¹⁰¹ like her sister, Agrippina, seems to have had much in common with her grandmother, the daughter of Augustus. After being restored by Claudius from exile, to which she had been condemned on a charge of adultery, she was again banished to an island as a result of further accusations, including that of adultery. Seneca was involved, and he suffered *relegatio*.¹⁰² It is noteworthy that whereas his life was spared on this occasion, as he tells us himself, through the intervention of the emperor,¹⁰³ he later attributes the death of Julia in exile to the same emperor.¹⁰⁴ The husband of Julia Livilla, M. Vinicius, who had aspired to the throne at the death of Gaius, was poisoned by Messalina, it is alleged, in 46, a year after his consulship.¹⁰⁵

Rubellius Plautus¹⁰⁶ was the son of the elder Julia, daughter of Drusus. He was as closely related to Augustus as Nero was, and a potential rival, as was shown by one of the charges laid against Agrippina when her power was waning.¹⁰⁷ He was asked by Nero to leave Rome in 60 for political reasons and was killed by order of that emperor in 62.¹⁰⁸ At the same time the death was ordered of F. Cornelius Sulla Felix, who had been considered worthy to replace Nero in charges laid against Pallas and Burrus in 55, and who had been exiled in 58 to Massilia, on political charges.¹⁰⁹ In his case too, connection with the royal house and privileges received had brought about his downfall, for, in addition to his own nobility, he had received in marriage

⁹⁹ Dio, LX, 8, 5; 18, 4; Tac., *Ann.*, XIII, 32, 5; Sen., *Apocol.*, 10.

¹⁰⁰ *P. I. R.*, I 422 (see n. 54).

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, I 444.

¹⁰² Dio, LXI, 10, 1.

¹⁰³ Sen., *Ad Polyb.*, 13, 2.

¹⁰⁴ Sen., *Apocol.*, 10.

¹⁰⁵ *P. I. R.*, V 445.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, R 85.

¹⁰⁷ Tac., *Ann.*, XIII, 19, 3.

¹⁰⁸ Tac., *Ann.*, XIV, 59.

¹⁰⁹ *P. I. R.*², C 1464.

the daughter of Claudius, Antonia, and was also a son of Domitia Lepida,¹¹⁰ the aunt of Nero. It is not unreasonable to assume that there was some suspicion of conspiracy on their part. They were the first political murders of this reign, except for the alleged poisoning of Silanus and Britannicus seven years earlier,¹¹¹ and there had been no death sentences in Rome for *maiestas*. The possibility of Gaul and Asia supporting such noble pretenders, and of Corbulo in Syria supporting Plautus, may have been less remote than Tacitus implies.¹¹² This is precisely the impression we get from the *Octavia*, where, for once, Nero is permitted a word in his own defence. He says:

Exilia non fregere summotos procul
Plautum atque Sullam, pertinax quorum furor
armat ministros sceleris in caedem meam; ¹¹³

After their deaths the senate itself proposed that their names be erased from the list of senators.¹¹⁴ Three years later the widow of Rubellius Plautus and her father were accused in the senate and anticipated their condemnation, which was none the less decreed, by committing suicide.¹¹⁵

Another group of families, whose history is a continuous pattern of pride and resentment followed by aspirations and mutual retaliation, was descended from Pompey. L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus ¹¹⁶ (cos. 32) was the adoptive son of L. Arruntius, who had been mentioned by Augustus, it was alleged by some, as worthy and prepared to be his successor, and who was condemned under Tiberius and committed suicide.¹¹⁷ Scribonianus revolted in 42, and though supported by many senators was deserted by his soldiers.¹¹⁸ His wife, Vibia, suffered *relegatio* ¹¹⁹

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, D 180.

¹¹¹ Tac., *Ann.*, XIII, 1, 15-17.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, XIV, 57, 2; 58, 1. The governor of Asia at this time was probably Barea Soranus (*P. I. R.*², B 55), and his friendship with Plautus was one of the accusations laid against him in his trial (*Ann.*, XVI, 30, 1).

¹¹³ *Octavia*, 464-6.

¹¹⁴ Tac., *Ann.*, XIV, 59, 6.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, XVI, 10-11.

¹¹⁶ *P. I. R.*², A 1140.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, A 1130.

¹¹⁸ Dio, LX, 15, 2-3.

¹¹⁹ Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 52, 1.

and in 52 his son,¹²⁰ who had been spared by Claudius with typical generosity, was exiled on a charge of magic practices directed against the emperor.¹²¹

The son of Scribonianus was a direct descendant of Pompey the Great,¹²² most likely through his grandmother, the wife of M. Furius Camillus.¹²³ Related to the Scriboniani, probably through her, and certainly through their common ancestor, Pompey, were the Scribonii Libones, who had added to their nobility a connection with the Caesars by the marriage of Scribonia to Augustus.¹²⁴ One of this family had been shown guilty of plotting twice against Tiberius and had committed suicide; his sister Scribonia named one of her sons after her famous ancestor.¹²⁵ This was Cn. Pompeius Magnus, whose paternal grandfather was the renowned L. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 15 B. C.), a close friend of Augustus and Tiberius.¹²⁶ Gaius forbade him to use the cognomen "Magnus"; his object in so doing was probably to restrain the manifestation of family pride which was implied in the use of this name.¹²⁷ Claudius restored to Pompeius the right to use it,¹²⁸ granted him the same privileges as L. Silanus, and gave him his daughter Antonia in marriage.¹²⁹ But for some reason not mentioned by the sources, he was killed, we are told, by Claudius, before the year 47,¹³⁰ and, like the next husband of Antonia,¹³¹ without a trial. The very fact that no motive is given seems almost certain proof that Messalina was not linked by tradition with the affair. That it was of a political nature is most likely, in view of the family background of Magnus and the fact that both his parents also lost their lives before 47, presumably at the same time.¹³² His father, M.

¹²⁰ *P. I. R.*², A 1147.

¹²¹ Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 52, 1.

¹²² *P. I. R.*, *ibid.*

¹²³ *P. I. R.*², F 576.

¹²⁴ Stemma, *P. I. R.*, S 214.

¹²⁵ *P. I. R.*, S 214, 221.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, P 477; *P. I. R.*², C 289.

¹²⁷ Suet., *Calig.*, 35, 1.

¹²⁸ Sen., *Apocol.*, 11.

¹²⁹ Dio, LX, 5, 8; 21, 5; 23, 1.

¹³⁰ Sen., *Apocol.*, 11; Dio, LX, 31, 7.

¹³¹ *P. I. R.*², C 1464.

¹³² Sen., *Apocol.*, 11.

Licinius Crassus Frugi,¹³³ is referred to by Seneca as *tam fatuum ut etiam regnare posset*,¹³⁴ which, though a reference to a well-known proverb¹³⁵ and to Claudius, may at the same time in its context imply that such hopes were entertained by him. He had twice received the *ornamenta triumphalia*,¹³⁶ a notable achievement which might show that the foundation for the witticism of Seneca was more his ambition to rule than his stupidity. Another son of Crassus, consul in 64, was accused and condemned between 66 and 68; the Scribonianus Camerinus, who was impersonated by a slave in 69, was probably his son, and had doubtless been killed or banished before that year.¹³⁷ His two younger brothers, Crassus Scribonianus¹³⁸ and L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi Licinianus,¹³⁹ survived the two reigns. The former was said to have been asked to seek the Imperial throne in 70, but to have declined.¹⁴⁰ He was later killed.¹⁴¹ Licinianus, the youngest son, who had been aged nine at the most when his parents were executed, spent a large part of his life in poverty,¹⁴² and probably never became a senator. His nobility, none the less, was partly responsible for his adoption by Galba, who gave him the coveted name of "Caesar."¹⁴³ Among his friends had been Rubellius Plautus, intimacy with whom had been thought worthy of its place in the accusations against Barea Soranus.¹⁴⁴ He was executed with Galba by Otho.¹⁴⁵ Licinia Magna¹⁴⁶ was the only known female member of this family. She married L. Piso¹⁴⁷—probably a son of the Piso who had been consul with her father in 27¹⁴⁸—who was killed in 70, being suspected

¹³³ *P. I. R.*, L 130.

¹³⁴ Sen., *Apocol.*, 11.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹³⁶ Suet., *Claud.*, 17, 3.

¹³⁷ *P. I. R.*, L 131, S 205.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, L 132.

¹³⁹ *P. I. R.*², C 300.

¹⁴⁰ Tac., *Hist.*, IV, 39.

¹⁴¹ Tac., *Hist.*, I, 48.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ *P. I. R.*², C 300.

¹⁴⁴ Tac., *Hist.*, I, 14; see n. 112.

¹⁴⁵ Tac., *Hist.*, I, 41 and 43.

¹⁴⁶ *P. I. R.*, L 185.

¹⁴⁷ *P. I. R.*², C 294, s. v.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, C 293.

of plotting against the emperor from his province. A similar charge had led to the death of his grandfather,¹⁴⁹ under Tiberius. His cousin Calpurnius Galerianus,¹⁵⁰ son of the conspirator of 65,¹⁵¹ had been killed in the previous year by Mucianus.¹⁵²

It seems to have been the case that families such as these were a danger to all emperors, not only the Julio-Claudians, since where active ambitions did not exist, there were always some who would attempt to create them in the belief that the association of a great name with a movement would increase its chances of success; since in addition to this consideration some senators were from an imperial point of view incorrigibly disloyal, the emperors were often put in a difficult position. Q. Pomponius Secundus was said to have been driven to civil war by the accusations of Suillius.¹⁵³ But that Tacitus' account is incomplete is suggested by the facts that he had as consul opposed Claudius after the death of Gaius,¹⁵⁴ that he owed his life to the intervention of Claudius,¹⁵⁵ and that the accusations of Suillius needed some foundation to drive the accused to civil war in the early years of Claudius' reign, a period of reconciliation.¹⁵⁶ Further, the brother of Pomponius had been virtually imprisoned for seven years by Tiberius, and was freed by Gaius.¹⁵⁷

The case of Annius Vinicianus was somewhat similar. He and his father,¹⁵⁸ members of a noble and successful family, had been accused together with Appius Silanus of *maiestas* in 32 but were freed.¹⁵⁹ He next participated in the murder of Caligula.¹⁶⁰ He attempted to have the *imperium* given to M. Vinicius, the

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, C 287.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, C 301.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, C 284.

¹⁵² Tac., *Hist.*, IV, 11.

¹⁵³ *P. I. R.*, P 564; Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 43, 3.

¹⁵⁴ Josephus, *B. J.*, II, 205.

¹⁵⁵ Josephus, *A. J.*, XIX, 263.

¹⁵⁶ The suggestion that Pomponius was involved in the revolt of Scribonianus (*P. I. R.*², A 1140, Groag) seems less likely when we consider that Dio mentions "many senators including a praetor" (LX, 15, 4) but makes no reference to Pomponius, consul in the previous year.

¹⁵⁷ *P. I. R.*, P 563.

¹⁵⁸ *P. I. R.*², A 677, 701.

¹⁵⁹ Tac., *Ann.*, VI, 9, 6-7.

¹⁶⁰ Josephus, *A. J.*, XIX, 18-20.

husband of Julia Livilla,¹⁶¹ who was related to him through his mother or grandmother, a member of the gens Vinicia.¹⁶² Having survived the accession of Claudius, he impelled Scribonianus to revolt, and committed suicide when the revolt failed.¹⁶³ Annius Pollio, most likely his son, was exiled in 65 for his alleged part in the Pisonian conspiracy.¹⁶⁴ Pollio was the son-in-law of Barea Soranus who was accused of having favoured the cause of Rubellius Plautus.¹⁶⁵ Barea and his daughter were compelled to commit suicide in the following year, the charges in her case involving bribery and magic practices.¹⁶⁶ About the same time there occurred at Beneventum another conspiracy, called "Viniciana" by Suetonius.¹⁶⁷ This was probably originated by the other son of Vinicianus who was a son-in-law of Corbulo;¹⁶⁸ and since Corbulo's death was ordered suddenly in 67¹⁶⁹ it would not be unreasonable to see some connection between the two events.

If the sources were more enlightening regarding family relationships many other accusations and condemnations of the period would appear to have arisen from more complex causes than those given. Statilius Taurus¹⁷⁰ committed suicide in 53 before a verdict was reached on charges of extortion and magic practices inspired, it is said, by Agrippina's envy of his gardens. Apart from the arguments of Scramuzza to show the incomplete nature of the sources,¹⁷¹ it must be noted that Taurus as well as being a descendant of T. Statilius Taurus¹⁷² (who had held almost all available honours under Julius Caesar and Augustus), and a grandson of the famous orator, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus,¹⁷³ was a brother of Taurus Statilius Corvinus

¹⁶¹ *P. I. R.*, V 445.

¹⁶² See *P. I. R.*², A 677, Groag.

¹⁶³ Dio, LX, 15, 1, 2, and 5.

¹⁶⁴ *P. I. R.*², A 678; Tac., *Ann.*, XV, 56, 4; 71, 6.

¹⁶⁵ *P. I. R.*², B 55; Tac., *Ann.*, XVI, 30, 1; see n. 112.

¹⁶⁶ Tac., *Ann.*, XVI, 21, 23, 30-33; schol. Juv. *ad* 6, 552.

¹⁶⁷ Suet., *Nero*, 36, 1.

¹⁶⁸ *P. I. R.*², A 700.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, D 142.

¹⁷⁰ *P. I. R.*, S 618.

¹⁷¹ Scramuzza, pp. 97-8.

¹⁷² *P. I. R.*, S 615.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, V 90.

who had conspired against Claudius in 46.¹⁷⁴ The two main sources of opposition—nobility and family grievances—were present in his case. The partner of Corvinus in the affair of 46 was Asinius Gallus, a grandson of Pollio who, along with Valerius Messalla, had been the greatest orator of the age, and a son of Asinius Gallus, who had allegedly been eager to rule after Augustus.¹⁷⁵ He was also a grandson of Agrippa, and a half-brother of the younger Drusus.¹⁷⁶ His father, a literary antagonist of Claudius,¹⁷⁷ had been condemned as a result of his support of Seianus.¹⁷⁸ Gallus revolted, we are told, with a few slaves, relying solely on his family background, and without the aid of soldiers.¹⁷⁹ It is noteworthy that his brother Ser. Asinius Celer was killed by Claudius before 47,¹⁸⁰ probably not because of his complicity in a movement of which the leader, his brother, had been merely exiled.¹⁸¹

At the end of the century, and even under emperors looked on favourably by senatorial tradition, the results of family pride and resentment can still be traced. Nero had put to death the patrician Sex. Cornelius Salvidienus Orfitus.¹⁸² About the year 93, another Salvidienus Orfitus, probably his son, was exiled and later executed for treason.¹⁸³ We find in 97, involved in a plot against Nerva, one C. Calpurnius Crassus Frugi Licinianus.¹⁸⁴ The same person was exiled for conspiracy by Trajan¹⁸⁵ and executed under Hadrian.¹⁸⁶ But by this time the face of the senate was completely changed. New families and provin-

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, S 595; Suet., *Claud.*, 13, 2.

¹⁷⁵ *P. I. R.*², A 1241, 1229; Asconius Pedianus (*ibid.*, A 1206) was reported to have been told by the latter that Vergil's Fourth Eclogue, dedicated to his father, Pollio, had been written in honour of his birth (Serv. *ad Verg.*, *Ecl.* 4, 11). For the history of the Asinii see the article of J. H. Oliver mentioned in note 72.

¹⁷⁶ Dio, LX, 27, 5; *P. I. R.*, I 144.

¹⁷⁷ Suet., *Claud.*, 41, 3.

¹⁷⁸ Dio, LVIII, 3, 1-4; 23, 6; Tac., *Ann.*, VI, 23, 1-3; 25, 2.

¹⁷⁹ Dio, LX, 27, 5; Suet., *Claud.*, 13, 2.

¹⁸⁰ Sen., *Apocol.*, 13.

¹⁸¹ Dio, LX, 27, 5.

¹⁸² Suet., *Nero*, 37, 1.

¹⁸³ *P. I. R.*², C 1445.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, C 259; Dio (Xiph.), LXVIII, 3, 2.

¹⁸⁵ Dio (Xiph.), LXVIII, 16, 2.

¹⁸⁶ *Vita Hadr.*, 5, 5, 6.

cials had replaced the old ruling classes, changing the senate into a body of individuals favourable to the system which had placed them there, wherein ability and loyalty rather than nobility earned promotion and privileges.

The history of the senate under the Julio-Claudians is mainly the history of its adaptation to a new political order, the implications of which were so well concealed by Augustus that the nobility did not become aware of its nature and possibilities till some time after his death. The crisis and turning point in senatorial resentment probably occurred in the period which has been considered here, precipitated by the hereditary succession of unworthy candidates. The acquiescence to the principate which then ensued was due in no small part to the disappearance of those who had constituted the opposition of that epoch, namely those who regarded republican nobility as the most important condition for pretenders to the greatest empire ever before ruled by one man, and those few who cherished outmoded ideas regarding the senate's functions or objected to the monopoly of power in the hands of emperors and the administrative centralisation then taking place. A new phase in the history of the senate was already beginning when a senator from Gaul based his appeal for support against Nero on the plea that the latter was abusing the sacred titles of "Caesar," "Imperator," and "Augustus."¹⁸⁷

The object of this study has been to suggest that in the accounts and traditions of the imperial persecution at this period there is much in favour of the view that provocation on the part of the opposition not only occurred, but was often such as to make the emperors' position very difficult. Though to defend imperial policy in many cases would be to err in the opposite direction, it does seem that a more even distribution of responsibility existed. The emperors could not be held accountable for the position in which they found themselves and can only be judged by their actions in excess of what was necessary for their own survival and the adequate performance of their duties.

What is interesting about these few decades of conflict and persecution is that there were seldom any irreconcilable ideological issues involved.¹⁸⁸ A restoration was never really expected

¹⁸⁷ Dio (Xiph.), LXIII, 22, 5.

¹⁸⁸ For several reasons, it is doubtful whether philosophy at this time

and most of the casualties were aspirants to the throne or their supporters.¹⁸⁹ The study of personalities is therefore of greater importance than in those epochs when persecution was or is inevitable by reason of different concepts of fundamentals.

D. MCALINDON.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD.

can be regarded as a revolutionary force. The idea of monarchy was acceptable to some at least; their opposition was "pas tout à fait politique dans son principe, mais plutôt morale" (Jocelyn M. C. Toynbee, "Dictators and Philosophers in the First Century A.D.," *G. & R.*, 1944, pp. 46-7 citing Boissier, etc.). Hence its prominence under Nero, as opposed to the previous reign. There was no unity among philosophers to permit an alliance with the active opposition among the nobility. Seneca taught Nero while Musonius taught Rubellius Plautus, probably with a similar end in view (Tac., *Ann.*, XIV, 59). Egnatius Celer, a Stoic, procured the condemnation of his pupil, Barea Soranus, who had been involved with Rubellius Plautus (Tac., *Ann.*, XVI, 32); in 69 Celer was accused by Musonius, another Stoic, and defended by the Cynic Demetrius (Tac., *Hist.*, IV, 10, 40). That the same Demetrius is to be identified with the *causidicus* and informer under Nero (schol. Juv., I, 33) is not impossible; M. Palfurius Sura, who was expelled from the senate by Vespasian, became a prominent Stoic and an infamous *delator* under Domitian (schol. Juv., 4, 53).

Even in the case of philosophers the human element cannot be overlooked. Opposition was most bitter where personal grievances were added to moral indignation. Thrasea Paetus and Barea Soranus, the two "arch-martyrs" (Toynbee, *loc. cit.*, p. 49), of the Stoic martyrology, had, as has been seen, good reason for hostility to the emperors apart from their philosophy. Helvidius Priscus, son-in-law of Thrasea, turned Cynic, presenting us with the familiar picture of an embittered young man "gone left" (Toynbee, *loc. cit.*, p. 56). The "paternum odium" of Paconius Agrippinus, his friend, has also been mentioned. Like most of the other philosophers, he died a natural death (D. R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism*, p. 128).

¹⁸⁹ *Ut imperium evertant libertatem praeferunt: si pervererint, libertatem ipsam adgredientur*—Cossutianus Capito (Tac., *Ann.*, XVI, 22, 8).

THE DATE OF THE *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS* OF SOPHOCLES.

There is almost no external evidence:¹ until and unless an inscription or a papyrus fragment is unearthed which will confirm one (or none) of the dates which have been proposed, we have nothing to work from but the text of the play itself.

Internal evidence, then, and the arguments from metrical and stylistic chronology are not decisive.² Such arguments will, at best, serve as a secondary support or a minor objection to dates arrived at by other means. These means are, in the main, allusions in the text to historical circumstances, and all of the attempts to date the play, beginning with Karl Friedrich Hermann's *Disputatio* (1834), rest on this type of foundation.

Many features of the plot and passages in the text have been interpreted as historical allusions,³ but the most impressive is the plague which afflicts Thebes at the opening of the play. At the present time this dramatic plague seems to be recognized as the most important element which may reflect a historical event with enough strength and clarity to be used for dating. It is seriously discussed by all writers on the subject whether they deny a connection between the dramatic and historical plagues,⁴ or feel that such a connection exists.⁵ The present

¹ All that we have is contained in the second hypothesis: ἡττηθέντα ὑπὸ Φιλοκλέους, ὡς φησι Δικαίπαρχος (cf. Aristides, II, p. 334, Dindorf). Philocles was a nephew of Aeschylus; he wrote a trilogy, the *Pandionis*, and also an *Oedipus* (cf. Nauck, *T. G. F.*, s. v. "Philocles").

² Cf. H. D. F. Kitto, "Sophocles, Statistics, and the *Trachiniae*" *A. J. P.*, LX (1939), pp. 178-93.

³ Especially, of course, the "tyrannos" stasimon (vv. 863-910), which Bruhn (p. 36) connects with the events of 457, Jebb and others with the events of 415, and Earle (*The Oedipus Tyrannus* [1901], p. 240, note on v. 885) with the "scandal about Phidias and the statue of Athena Parthenos." For a negative attitude to the passage as evidence for dating cf. Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, XXXIV, p. 59 (cited by Bruhn, p. 37).

⁴ E. g. Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, I, 2, p. 361, n. 3; Maurice Croiset, *L'Oedipe-Roi de Sophocle* (1931), pp. 30 f.; J. T. (now Sir John) Sheppard, *The Oedipus Tyrannus* (Cambridge, 1920), note on v. 25, p. 100.

⁵ E. g. Pohlenz, *Die gr. Tragödie*² (1954), p. 220 (also *Erläuterungen*, p. 93); Cedric H. Whitman, *Sophocles*, pp. 49 ff.

paper attempts to offer new evidence for such a connection, and suggests a date for the play which differs from that proposed by other upholders of the connection between the plague in Athens and the plague in Thebes.

Our evidence (admittedly incomplete) goes to show that the plague is not a traditional feature of the Oedipus story. Homer makes no mention of a plague. "Presently the gods made these things [i. e. the real identity of Oedipus] known to men," he says, but he does not tell us how.⁶ Pindar does not mention the plague,⁷ and the summary of the Aeschylean *Oedipus* given in the final stasimon of *The Seven against Thebes* does not mention it either. "But when he came to knowledge of his fateful marriage . . ." runs the relevant passage (778-80). It does not explain how. From what little we know and can surmise about the lost epic, the *Oedipodea*, the plague seems to play no part in that version.⁸ Moreover, there is no reference to the plague in Euripides' *Phoenissae*, although in several passages, as is the manner of the later Euripidean tragedies, the legend as a whole is recapitulated.⁹ There is no trace of the plague in later authorities. The Attic historian Androtion, whose account is quoted at some length in the scholium on *Odyssey*, XI, 271, does not mention it. "Later," he says, "Jocasta, realizing that she had had intercourse with her own son, hanged herself." And there is no mention of the plague in the much later accounts of Apollodorus¹⁰ and Diodorus.¹¹

All these, it must be admitted, are arguments *ex silentio*; yet it should be noticed that Homer, Aeschylus, Euripides, and Androtion all mention the discovery of the truth, the point at which they would be expected to refer to the plague if it had been a traditional feature of the Oedipus story. The plague

⁶ *Odyssey*, XI, 274 ff.

⁷ *Olymp.* 2, 42 ff.

⁸ See Pausanias, IX, 5, 10-11.

⁹ Cf. the very full exposition of the legend in the prologue of the play. The discovery of the truth is described in the same terms as those used by pre-Sophoclean writers: *μαθὼν δὲ τὰ μὰ λέκτρα*, etc. (59); there is no mention of plague. Tiresias' phrase *νοσεῖ γὰρ ἥδε γῆ πάλαι, Κρέον* (867) is clearly metaphorical; he continues *ἐξ οὗ 'τεκνώθη Λαῖος βίᾳ θεῶν*.

¹⁰ *Bibliotheca*, III, 9: *φανέντων δὲ ὕστερον τῶν λανθανόντων*. . . .

¹¹ IV, 65: *τῶν περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀσεβημάτων γνωσθέντων*. . . .

in Thebes seems to be a Sophoclean invention;¹² to the extent that this is accepted, the connection between the Theban and the Attic plagues becomes more probable.

But is the Sophoclean plague comparable to the plague in Athens? There are of course some verbal resemblances between the Sophoclean and the Thucydidean descriptions,¹³ but many of them can be discounted as phrases which are almost inevitable in any description of a plague. And in any case, it has been argued,¹⁴ the Sophoclean plague has the marks of a literary and religious, rather than a historical phenomenon; it is the traditional threefold blight (often the effect of a curse), not a real epidemic like that which struck the Athenians in 430 B. C. The plague in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is not only a disease which attacks the population (168), it includes also a blight on the crops (25, 171), the death of the cattle (26), and the abortive birth-pangs of the women (26-7, 173-4). These last three features are common in descriptions of supernatural afflictions, and are also a regular formula of curses. "When the Pelasgians had killed their children," says Herodotus (VI, 139), "the earth refused to bring forth its crops for them, their wives bore fewer children, and their herds increased more slowly than before. . . ." "Do this," says Cambyses to the Persians (Herodotus, III, 65), "and then may your land bring forth crops abundantly, and your wives bear children and your herds increase . . . but if you do not . . . then my curse be on you, and may the opposite of all these things happen to you." These same three features are found also in the blessings of the Eumenides in Aeschylus (naturally in negative form),¹⁵ in the text of the "Amphictyonic curse" given by Aeschines,¹⁶ and in Philostratus' account of

¹² Bruhn (p. 11) points to the full exposition given to the subject of the plague in the opening scenes as a sign of its novelty to the audience. Cf. also Robert, *Oedipus*, p. 69.

¹³ Most of them will be found in Sheppard's commentary. They do not, of course, imply that Sophocles had read Thucydides; both of them may be expressing independent personal observation. For that matter it is possible that Thucydides is echoing Sophocles.

¹⁴ This argument is most thoroughly presented by Sheppard.

¹⁵ Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 939-49.

¹⁶ In *Ctes.*, 111. For parallels in inscriptions cf. Louis Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, pp. 313 ff. It seems strange that Bruhn did not cite the Aeschines passage to strengthen his case for dating the play around the time of the Athenian interference in Delphic affairs.

the blight which attacked the Ethiopians after they killed Ganges their king;¹⁷ two of them are found as part of a curse in a papyrus fragment of Eupolis' *Demoi*.¹⁸

It is clear enough that Sophocles is drawing on a literary and religious tradition which goes back far beyond the Athenian plague; the plague in Thebes has three features which are closely associated with supernatural forces and appear in religious contexts. This fact has been used to suggest that there is no connection between the plague in Thebes and the plague in Athens. Surely it suggests exactly the opposite. The blight which affects Thebes has indeed the three traditional features, failure of crops, cattle, and human births, but it also has something else which is not part of the traditional blight at all—the plague. In none of the passages which describe the traditional blight is there a reference to a disease (*νόσος*, *λοιμός*, are the terms used by Sophocles—and Thucydides) which attacks the whole population: the traditional blight is confined to crops, cattle, and pregnant women. What Sophocles has done is to take the traditional threefold blight and add to it the plague. "We have thus, as it were," runs Mortimer Lampson Earle's brilliant note, "*λοιμός* and *λοιμός* combined."¹⁹

This surely requires an explanation. Sophocles had a dramatic problem—to find an imperative factor which would set in motion the process of discovery; he could not say "and suddenly they realized the truth," for the plot of his play consists of that discovery. He needed something that would impel Oedipus to search for the murderer of Laius. But surely the threefold blight would have been enough. It would have served the purpose admirably; the supernatural associations of such a blight were precisely what the dramatic situation demanded. But he added to the blight the plague. There can surely be only one reason why he did so: the plague at Athens.

¹⁷ *Vita Apollodori*, III, 20.

¹⁸ *P. Oxy.*, VI (1908), no. 862 (p. 172). Cf. also Hdt., IX, 39 (Apollonia, cattle and crops only) and Paus., VI, 11, 7 (Thasos, crops only).

¹⁹ P. 144. The preceding sentences run: "The addition of the plague to blight and the subsequent raising to exclusive importance of the plague (v. 167 sqq.) suggests the possibility that in an earlier version of the story of Oedipus (that of Aeschylus?) there may have been a blight but no plague and that Sophocles added this feature with reference to the plague at Athens. . . ."

If the plague which is added to the traditional blight is a reference to a contemporary situation, why, it may be asked, did Sophocles bother with the blight at all? Why not just the plague? Part of the answer to that question is that the three features of the religious blight did actually correspond to conditions in plague stricken Attica; Sophocles introduced a contemporary detail, the plague, and was able to suggest contemporary applications for the traditional religious details as well.

"The whole host of my city is sick," the chorus sings, "and the products of our famous soil do not increase" (169-71). There was, so far as we know, no failure of the crops in Attica in the early plague years (though, as we shall see, there was later), but these words of the chorus are a good description of what was happening to the Attic farms. Year after year the Peloponnesian armies cut down olive and fruit trees, burned crops, and trampled down vines; "men dying inside and the land devastated outside" is Thucydides' laconic description of the condition of Athens and Attica during the early years of the war (II, 54). The land might well be described as "blighted in the crop-laden blossoms of the soil"—the phrase used by the priest to picture the effects of the plague in Thebes.

What happened to the Athenian cattle during the invasions and the plague? According to Thucydides, they were removed to Euboea and the neighboring islands at the beginning of the war (II, 14); but it seems unlikely that such a policy can have been fully enforced over so large an area against the passive resistance which farmers, in all ages and places, have exerted against attempts to part them from their livestock. There is a fragment of Andocides, in fact, which gives a vivid picture of the refugees coming into Athens bringing their cattle with them. "May we never see again the charcoal-burners and their sheep and cattle and wagons coming from the hills. . . ." ²⁰ What cattle there were in Athens must have suffered, whether from plague or neglect,²¹ and Thucydides, when he wants to describe the miserable end of the men who were left untended, says that they died "like sheep" (*ὥσπερ τὰ πρόβατα*, II, 25).

²⁰ Cf. Suidas, *s. v.* σκάνδιξ.

²¹ Thucydides (II, 50) mentions the infection of carnivorous birds and animals.

Or do these words mean "like the sheep,"—the sheep brought into the city by the farmers?

As for the abortive births, it is very possible that in the inferno described by Thucydides they were unusually numerous, if not a product of the plague itself.²² Certainly any that occurred would be interpreted as another sign that the plague was a manifestation of divine anger or a curse. There must have been many in Athens who so regarded it; even Pericles, in his last speech, refers to it in these terms: "the visitations of heaven (τὰ δαιμόνια) we must bear with resignation" (II, 64). And Thucydides tells us that many Athenians connected the plague with the hostile and menacing pronouncement of the Delphic oracle, made just before hostilities began;²³ they saw the plague as something sent by the god, and would so naturally see in it features of the traditional religious blight on the land.

The fact that the plague is an addition to the legendary material and to the threefold blight may be said to establish a strong probability that Sophocles had the Athenian plague in mind. There is a puzzling phrase in the text of the play which makes sense only in terms of such a reference, and which goes far towards turning the probability into a certainty. In the third strophe of the first stasimon the chorus prays for the defeat of "raging Ares" ("Ἀρεά τε τὸν μαλερόν, 190). This is an extraordinary prayer. For one thing it completely ignores the fictive dramatic situation; this chorus cannot in these lines be thought of as a chorus of Theban elders. Ares, whom they go on to call "the god without honor among the gods" (τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν, 215) is perhaps the most important patron deity of Thebes, associated with the city in myth and cult. In Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes* the chorus of Theban women calls on Ares in its hour of danger, begging him not to abandon his own city. "Ares, guard the city of Cadmus . . . show your care for it manifestly" (135-6); "Golden-helmeted divinity, look down, look down on this city which you once made your best-beloved" (106-7); "Will you betray, Ares, your own

²² One of the features of a mysterious epidemic at Thasos described in Hippocrates, *Epid.* I, 13-26 was "difficult childbirth" (ἐδύστοκεον δὲ πλείεσται, 16). "All who chanced to fall ill while pregnant, that I know of, aborted" (*ibid.*: διέφθειραν πᾶσαι ἂς ἐγὼ οἶδα).

²³ Thuc., II, 54.

city?" (104-5). But the Theban chorus of the Sophoclean play speaks of Ares not as a protector, but as a hostile invader, and they speak of him (not *to* him) with fear and hatred. They actually conclude the strophe with a prayer to Zeus to destroy Ares with his thunderbolt (202). The Theban origin of the chorus has clearly been forgotten; the only possible explanation of so dramatically inappropriate a prayer is that Sophocles was thinking, not of Thebes, but of Athens.

And in any case, what is Ares doing here at all? His invocation by the Aeschylean chorus is fully appropriate, for Thebes is under armed attack, but the Thebes of Oedipus is not at war. Ares in this passage is identified with the plague; "he burns me" (φλέγει με, 192), sings the chorus, and "the flame of plague" (φλόγα πύματος, 166) is one of the many phrases in the ode which refer to the plague in terms of fire. This identification of Ares with the plague is unprecedented and found no imitators; the labor and ingenuity of generations of commentators has been unable to find even the ghost of a parallel to it.²⁴

But the phrase cries aloud for explanation. And a simple explanation lies ready to hand in the conditions in Athens during the early years of the war, the combination of plague and armed invasion which was year after year a feature of the spring season. To the stricken Athenians the plague seemed to be simply an aspect of the war, Ares. They were assailed by plague within the walls and the Peloponnesian armies without. "The plague attacked them and the war too," as Thucydides puts it (II, 59).²⁵ The imagery which Sophocles employs to evoke the onslaught of the plague is such as to suggest the movement of an invading army, which attacks and burns, with shouts of battle (φλέγει με περιβόατος ἀντιάζων, 191). The prayer for the defeat of the plague maintains the metaphor; "may he turn his back and run from the land of our fathers" (δράμημα νοτίσαι, 193). Surely the words of this strophe cannot be considered

²⁴ The Homeric Hymn to Ares, which contains sixteen epithets of Ares in the first five lines, has nothing which even vaguely hints at plague. The closest approximation to this striking identification is to be found in the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus. In two passages (659-66 and 678-85) the chorus couples plague and Ares; λοιμός . . . Ἄρης in the first case, and Ἄρη . . . νόσων in the second. But, though associated, they are here clearly separate things.

²⁵ ἡ νόσος ἐπέκειτο καὶ ὁ πόλεμος. Cf. also III, 3.

appropriate to anything in the play, nor even to anything outside it, except after 430 B. C., the first outbreak of the plague in an Athens beleaguered by invading armies. In fact, except in this situation, the words of this strophe are hardly intelligible.

This argument, if accepted, gives us a *terminus post quem* of 430. But this same first stasimon contains a number of phrases which, like the description of Ares, seem to demand explanation in contemporary terms, and which suggest a more definite, and later, date.

The first stasimon, which in its dramatic place and time is a prayer of the people of Oedipean Thebes for relief from the plague, is full of expressions, emphases, and references which suggest an Athenian rather than a Theban atmosphere. It begins with a dramatically appropriate address to the oracular message which the chorus is waiting for, and proceeds by a natural transition to Apollo. But it calls him "Delian Healer" (Δάλιε Παιάν, 154). This title, though it is not inappropriate for a Theban chorus (as Jebb points out), is yet significant for an Athenian audience; the Athenian connotations of the word "Delian" need no emphasis. And since Jebb's time a papyrus fragment of Pindar has presented us with an almost identical refrain—*ἰήε Δάλι' Ἀπολλον*—in what seems to be part of a paean composed for the Athenians.²⁶ In the antistrophe the prayer proper begins: "First I call upon you, daughter of Zeus, immortal Athena" (158-9). This address to the Athenian goddess is repeated later (185): "send rescue, golden daughter of Zeus," an epithet²⁷ which would surely recall to the audience Phidias' magnificent statue and the gold-plate on it which was not only a symbol of Athenian wealth, but also the war-reserve of the Athenian state. The next deity invoked is Artemis, and the words of the invocation, though their exact meaning is disputed, contain Athenian as well as Theban references. "Artemis who sits in her circular seat in [or, consisting of] the market place, the goddess of Fair Fame" (161-2).²⁸ There was a temple

²⁶ Bowra, frag. 39.

²⁷ This is the only example of the application of this epithet to Athena in Sophocles. It is also rarely found elsewhere (cf. Bruchmann, *Epitheta Deorum*, p. 16).

²⁸ For the Theban reference of this passage see Jebb *ad loc.*

of Fair Fame (Εὐκλεία) at Athens, built, Pausanias tells us, from the spoils taken at Marathon (I, 14, 5); Pindar refers to the Athenian market place as "fair-famed" (εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν, frag. 63, Bowra); and a part of the Athenian market place was known as "the circle" (κύκλος).²⁹ Clearly the effect of these details is to suggest a parallel between the situation in Thebes and that in Athens, a parallel which is, for that matter, maintained throughout the play.³⁰

Athena, Artemis, and Apollo are called upon to appear; "if ever against former ruin attacking the city you drove the flame of pain beyond our borders, come now also" (προτέρας ἄτας ὕπερ, 164). The "flame of pain" is the plague, which is described in terms of fire throughout. Why should the Theban chorus talk like this? There had been no "former" visitation of the plague in Thebes. Bruhn (one of the few who notices the problem raised by this phrase) attempts to side-step the difficulty by explaining "former ruin" as the depredations of the Sphinx;³¹ but this does not fit the expression "flame of pain," which refers to the plague, and in any case the Sphinx was dealt with not by Athena, Artemis, and Apollo, but by Oedipus, whether with the help of some un-named god (as the priest suggests) or by his own unaided intelligence (as Oedipus claims). There is no explanation possible in terms of the myth or the dramatic situation. The phrase must refer to Athens, and it suggests a state of affairs in which the plague has appeared for a second time.

Thucydides' account of the plague presents us with exactly such a situation. "In the following winter," he says (i.e. the winter of 427-6), "the plague, which had never entirely disappeared, although abating for a time, again attacked the Athenians. It continued on this second occasion not less than a year, having previously (τὸ δὲ πρότερον) lasted for two years" (III, 87). Although the plague never entirely disappeared during the whole period, there was yet enough of a relief from the epidemic for Thucydides to call the outbreak in the winter of 427-6 a "second occasion"—"it attacked again" he says. This

²⁹ Cf. Schol. Ar. *Equ.*, 137; Eur., *Or.*, 919; Thuc., III, 74.

³⁰ For the general parallel cf. "Why is Oedipus called *Tyrannos*?" *C. J.*, Dec. 1954, pp. 1 ff.

³¹ Note on v. 165 (p. 72).

second outbreak, or a time near enough to it for the emotions of the occasion to be vividly remembered, is a situation in which the lines under consideration are fully apposite as a description of conditions in Athens. "Appear to me, you triple defenders against death, if ever against former ruin attacking the city you drove beyond our borders the flame of pain, come now too."

This second outbreak of the plague began in the late autumn of 427 and ended in the winter of 426-5. Our new *terminus post quem* is autumn 427, and the first date possible for the production of the play is Spring, 426 (if, that is, it was produced at the Dionysia).

There is some evidence to suggest an even later date. In this same first stasimon there is another phrase which demands explanation. "Ares the raging, who now unbronzed with shields burns me . . . (ὅς νῦν ἀχαλκός ἀσπίδων, 190-1). This Ares is the plague, which to the Athenians seems to be simply another form of the war; but what is meant by "who *now* unbronzed with shields"? The plague is an Ares who attacks without military panoply, but the word "now" suggests that on a previous occasion he *had* been "bronzed with shields." That is to say, the present occasion seems to be an attack by plague alone as distinguished from a previous attack, or attacks, by plague and war combined. Such an occasion, plague alone, is to be found in the summer of 426, when, with the plague raging anew in Athens, the Peloponnesian armies turned back before crossing the Attic frontier.³²

There are some additional indications that this stasimon refers to the summer of 426. Thucydides gives us no details about the second outbreak of the plague, but in Diodorus there is a full and fascinating account of it.³³ "The Athenians," he says, "after a certain period of relief from the pestilential disease, were again subjected to the same misfortunes. . . . In the previous winter there had been very heavy rains, and consequently the soil was soaked; many hollows received a large

³² Earle (p. 53 and note on v. 190) was, as far as I can tell, the first to see the implication of the word νῦν; for him it is evidence for the correctness of the "traditional" date, 429.

³³ Diodorus, XII, 58. Zimmern, *Greek Commonwealth*, p. 36, refers Diodorus' description to 430 (an error which is still uncorrected in the fifth edition, the latest I have been able to consult).

quantity of water and turned into swamps—they held stagnant water exactly like permanent marshes. . . . In addition to the disease there was the bad condition of the crops which came up. For the crops this year were completely watery and corrupted in their essence (*διεφθαρμένην ἔχοντες τὴν φύσιν*). A third cause of the disease was the failure of the Etesian winds, which normally in the hot season reduce the heat to a large extent. As the temperature rose, the air became fiery . . ." (*τοῦ ἀέρος ἐμπύρου γενομένου . . .*).

This description of the condition of Attica in the summer of 426 has many features which illuminate the Sophoclean plague. There was disease in the city, the crops were a failure (and in the conditions Diodorus describes it is hardly likely that the cattle remained healthy), and Diodorus' description of the unprecedented heat suggests an added appropriateness for the Sophoclean reference to the plague as fire and its action as burning.

If the Sophoclean plague is conceived in terms of the second outbreak in Athens, and particularly of the terrible summer of 426, the earliest possible date for the production of the play is Spring 425. The first stasimon supplies one more piece of evidence, which tends to confirm that date. "Delian Healer," sings the chorus, "I stand in awe of you—what thing will you accomplish (or, exact), something new, or something repeated in the revolutions of the seasons?" (*τί μοι ἢ νέον ἢ περιτελλομέναις ὥραις πάλιν ἐξανύσεις χρέος*; 155-7). "What expiation"—so runs Jebb's paraphrase—"wilt thou prescribe as the price of deliverance from the plague? Will it be an expiation of a new kind? Of will some ancient mode of atonement be called into use once more?"

What is this all about? It does not seem to refer to anything specifically Theban, or any known detail of the myth, and yet it is too precise and emphatic a formula to be dismissed as a mere piece of tragic or religious atmosphere. But if the play was produced in the Spring of 425, the passage makes very good sense. For in the winter of 426-5 the Athenians had in fact tried to obtain relief from the plague by expiation made to Delian Apollo.

"The Athenians," says Diodorus' account, "because of the excessive ravages of the disease, referred the origins of the dis-

aster to the divine. For this reason, and in accordance with a certain oracle (κατὰ τινα χρησμόν), they purified the island of Delos." Thucydides, in his account of the purification of Delos, also mentions "some oracle" (κατὰ χρησμόν δὴ τινα, III, 104), though he does not specifically connect the purification of the island with the plague.

An act of expiation, then, had been demanded from the Athenians by oracular authority, and this act was the purification of the island of Delos. But it was not a new form of expiation for the Athenians. Pisistratus the *tyrannos*, as Thucydides tells us, had already purified the island, though incompletely (III, 104). And he did it, according to Herodotus, as a result of prophecies (ἐκ τῶν λογίων, I, 64). The expiation corresponds closely to the terms of the Sophoclean chorus; it is connected with Delian Apollo, and it is not "new" but something done "again in the revolution of the seasons."

If the *Oedipus Tyrannus* was produced at the Greater Dionysia in 425, or even in the next year, all these puzzling expressions are explained; not only that, they can be seen as adding to the effect of the play when it was first produced a whole dimension of immediate reference which must have heightened the effectiveness of the performance enormously. It is possible, however, to choose between these two dates. There is some evidence to show that the date of the play's performance was 425, not 424.

In the opening months of 424, at the Lenaea, Aristophanes produced his comedy *The Knights*. And in this comedy it is possible to point out (as one would expect if the *Oedipus Tyrannus* was produced the year before), some parodic references to and echoes of the Sophoclean masterpiece.³⁴

³⁴ A few of the parallels of phrase and situation between the *anagnorisis* in *The Knights* and that of the Sophoclean play have been noticed by Valerio Milio in his article "Per la cronologia dell' *Edipo Re*," *Boll. Fil. Class.*, XXXV (1928-9), pp. 203-5. On this basis he too suggests a *terminus ante quem* of 424 for the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Of the resemblances discussed below he mentions *Equ.*, 1240—*O. T.*, 738 and *Equ.*, 1244—*O. T.*, 834-5, and points out some minor verbal coincidences (e.g. πῶς εἶπας, *Equ.*, 1237—πῶς εἶπας, *O. T.*, 942, 1018) which do not carry much weight. His general statement on the resemblances puts the case well: "si tratta non della parodia di una frase ma della imitazione di tutta una situazione tragica" (p. 205).

The central factor of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is a prophecy—a prophecy made by the Delphian Apollo, apparently false, and finally triumphantly vindicated. And in *The Knights* also the core of the plot is a Delphic prophecy, a prophecy about the fate of Cleon which he fears and conceals but which is in the end fulfilled. Demosthenes steals and reads the prophecy at the beginning of the play. "Damned Paphlagonian" he says "so this is what you have been keeping secret and guarding against for so long. . . . It's all in here, how he is to be destroyed" (125-7). Demosthenes tells the sausage-seller who is to replace Cleon—"you are to become, this oracle says here, the greatest man" (ἀνὴρ μέγιστος, 177-8). Oedipus, explaining his past to Jocasta, describes himself in the same phrase—"I was thought to be the greatest man of the citizens there" (ἀνὴρ ἀστῶν μέγιστος, 775-6). In the figure of the Paphlagonian there seems to be more than a touch of the Oedipus who raged against Tiresias and Creon as conspirators. "By the twelve gods," he shouts, "you will not get away with it—you are conspirators against the people from of old" (οὐ τοι . . . χαιρήσετε, 235). "But you will not get away with it" (ἀλλ' οὐ τι χαίρων, 313) says Oedipus to Tiresias. Oedipus' angry dismissal of Creon—"Get out" (οὐκ αὖ μ' ἔασεις; 676) is repeated by Cleon in his quarrel with the sausage-seller—"Get out" (οὐκοῦν μ' ἔασεις; 338) and Cleon flings at his opponent the word Oedipus uses against both Creon and Tiresias—"Fool" (μῶρος, *Kn.* 350, *O. T.* 540, 433).

These verbal resemblances are of course easily explicable as coincidence; the expressions used are also found, and frequently, elsewhere. But they begin to appear as something more than a coincidence when Cleon and the sausage-seller get to work on each other's parentage. "I say," says Cleon, "that you belong to the family of those accursed by the goddess" (445-6), that is, the Alcmaeonidae, the family of Pericles—a highly ridiculous charge considering the insight we have been given into the sausage-seller's birth and education. The sausage-seller, unabashed, brings a counter-charge. "And I say that your grandfather was one of the body-guard of. . . ." "Of whom, say," Cleon interrupts (ποίων, φράσον, 448). This sounds very like a reminiscence of the Sophoclean play. "I seem a fool to you," says Tiresias, "but I seemed sane to the parents who begot you." "What parents? Wait," Oedipus replies (ποίοισι,

μείνον, 437). And there is another passage in which Oedipus asks an anxious question about his parents. Told that his name derives from his swollen feet, he asks: "In the gods' name who did it? My mother or my father? Say" (πρὸς μητρὸς ἢ πατρὸς, φράσον, 1037). Cleon's agitated ποίων, φράσον sounds like an echo of both these questions of Oedipus.

Later in the comedy, pleading with Demos, Cleon urges him not to be influenced by whoever happens to be speaking (μὴ τοῦ λέγοντος ἴσθι, 860); this is exactly Jocasta's phrase to describe Oedipus in his confusion (ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τοῦ λέγοντος, 917). Cleon's collapse comes when he recognizes, like Oedipus, that the oracle has been fulfilled. And in this passage, the climax of the play, the language is deliberately parodic of a tragic *anagnorisis*.³⁵ When Cleon is told by Demos and his adversary the sausage-seller to put down his crown, he replies: "No. I have a Pythian oracle which describes the only man by whom I can be defeated" (1229-30). He questions the sausage-seller about his antecedents, and finds that the answers one after another correspond to the oracle's specifications. The questions he puts are very like those which Oedipus asks the herdsman at the beginning of the climactic scene of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. "What trade did you pursue as you came to manhood?" asks Cleon (1241). "What work were you employed in, what way of life?" Oedipus asks the herdsman (1124). The answers are, of course, different, but the next question is essentially the same in both cases. "Did you sell your sausages right in the market place, or at the gates?" (1245-6). "What places chiefly did you range with your flocks?" (1126). "Cithaeron and the neighboring country," replies the shepherd (1127), and the sausage-seller answers, "At the gates, where the salt fish is sold" (1247). The questions and answers in *The Knights* present an urban parodic version of the pastoral scenes conjured up by the questions and answers in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

Cleon's reactions to the sausage-seller's replies are in high tragic style. "O Phoebus, Lycian Apollo, what will you do to me?" (ὦ Φοῖβ' Ἀπολλὼν Λύκιε, τί ποτε μ' ἐργάσει; 1240). A parody of a line in the *Bellerophon* of Euripides, says the

³⁵ "Sequitur ἀναγνώρισις vere tragica numeris et verbis insignis," says Van Leeuwen.

scholiast, but it sounds also like an echo of the tragic cry of Oedipus when he hears Jocasta's account of the death of Laius: "O Zeus, what have you planned to do to me?" (ω Ζεῦ τί μου δρᾶσαι βεβουλεύσαι πέρι; 738).³⁶ After the discovery of the sausage-seller's trade Cleon is convinced that he is lost (1243). But he recovers. He has one hope, one question more. "There is a slim hope on which we ride at anchor. Tell me just this much" ($\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\eta\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\prime\ \epsilon\phi'\ \eta\varsigma\ \omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}$ 1244-5). So Oedipus, after the revelations of Jocasta, has one remaining hope, one question to put to the herdsman, the answer to which will ruin or save him. "I have in fact just this much hope" ($\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \mu\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, 836). The answer to Cleon's question convinces him that the oracle has been fulfilled. "Alas, the god's prophecy has been carried out" (1248). So Oedipus recognizes the truth: "Oh, it all comes out clear and true" (1182).

Each one of these Aristophanic resemblances to the language and situations of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is slight enough in itself, but taken all together they seem suggestive. If they can be considered convincing, they fix the date January 424 as the *terminus ante quem*, and the first performance of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* must then have taken place in 425. If not, the date of the performance must still be close enough to the summer of 426 for the allusions to the second outbreak of the plague and the purification of Delos to be timely, and the best date for those requirements is still 425.

BERNARD M. W. KNOX.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

³⁶ The Sophoclean line is clearly parodied in the later *Peace*. Cf. 62, ω Ζεῦ τί δρασείεις ποθ' ἡμῶν τὸν λεών; and 106, $\delta\ \tau\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ [*sc.* Ζεὺς] Ἑλλήνων πέρι. The parody here is surely clear enough to rule out any date for the *Oedipus Tyrannus* later than 422.

HORACE, THE UNWILLING WARRIOR: *SATIRE* I, 9.

In his monumental study of the influence of Lucilius upon Horace, G. C. Fiske brought the question as close to a definite answer as the fragmentary nature of Lucilius would permit. Considering these few remnants and the well-known scruples of Horace against extended verbal imitation, one must admit that Fiske emerged with an impressive list of similar motifs and expressions between the two satirists.¹ To be sure, similarities in detail are not always an exact indication of the individual method of treatment,² and the latitude, which a poet might require, was never denied Horace.³ When he came to consider *S.*, I, 9, Fiske inherited a theory first advanced by Iltgen,⁴ but ignored by subsequent scholars,⁵ that the *Satire* was largely influenced by an earlier work of Lucilius. Careful study of Horace and an imaginative reconstruction of the fragments of Book VI of Lucilius convinced Fiske that Horace was indebted, not merely for lines, but for the general plan of his poem. "We may conclude, therefore, that the sixth book of Lucilius contained a satire upon the bore, which was the direct model for Horace's ninth satire of the first book."⁶

Of approximately fifteen lines in Lucilius which confirmed Fiske in his opinion, perhaps those which are most generally accepted as influencing Horace's poem are 231-2 (Marx):

¹ G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace: a Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (Madison, 1920).

² Vergil offers the best example of controlled imitation. In his important book, V. Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Wiesbaden, 1950), studies Vergil's use of Homeric similes and reaches striking conclusions about the former's methods of imitation.

³ E. g., Fiske, pp. 46, 134.

⁴ J. J. Iltgen, *De Horatio Lucilii Aemulo* (Montbaur, 1872), pp. 18 and 19.

⁵ None of the following editions regard the influence of Lucilius upon *S.*, I, 9 as significant beyond lines 1 and 78: L. Mueller (Wien, 1891); J. Orellius, 4th ed. (Berlin, 1892); J. H. Kirkland (Boston, 1894); P. Lejay (Paris, 1911); E. P. Morris (New York, 1909); Kiessling-Heinze, 5th ed. (Berlin, 1921).

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 335.

(nil) ut discrepat ac 'τὸν δὲ ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων'
fiat.⁷

The Greek phrase resembles so closely Horace, I, 9, 78: *sic me servavit Apollo*, that, even without the authority of Porphyrio,⁸ a connection between the two passages would ultimately have been observed. The question next arises: In what sense and why is Horace imitating Lucilius? The answers proposed fall into three main groups:

1. Horace, like Lucilius, is referring to the ultimate source of the allusion, Homer. He thus, like Lucilius, acquires the advantages of epic parody and ends his description on a humorous note appropriate to the ironic character that he here most successfully achieves.

2. Horace is implicitly criticizing Lucilius for citing the original Greek.⁹ He therefore carefully translates the Greek, places the line in a significant position, and still has the advantages of parody.

3. Horace is implicitly criticizing Lucilius' uneconomic use of the parody and demonstrating his own technical superiority. It appears that Lucilius inserted the Greek phrase, as was frequently his custom, to serve as a witty contrast, as a neat, exaggerated reference to an incident entirely alien to his context.¹⁰ On the other hand, when Horace adopts this phrase as his conclusion, he cleverly makes it relevant to his dramatic development. Here, the focus of economy is *Apollo*. As the god who watches over poets and concerns himself with principles of justice, Apollo can be regarded, on the supernatural level, as the agent effecting Horace's release from the *garrulus*. In human terms, the bore's legal opponent appeared when Horace was desperate, dragged the fool off to justice, and thus left Horace

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 335: "The closing line of the Horatian satire was directly modelled on that of Lucilius, as is proved by Porphyrio's quotation of line 231."

⁸ Porphyr.: "Hoc de illo sensu Homericō sumpsit, quem et Lucilius in sexto Satirarum repraesentavit sic dicens. . ."

⁹ Cf. Horace's attacks on Lucilius' use of Greek words in *S.*, I, 10, 23 ff.

¹⁰ Cf. the reconstruction of Lucilius' argument by Fiske, *op. cit.*, pp. 335 ff.

a free man. It is, however, the genius of Horace to transform this experience into an amusing drama, to picture Apollo as a *deus ex machina*, and to give the scene a finished form by recalling the opening reference to his poetic concerns (line 2).

It is evident that none of these explanations of 9, 78 is exclusively correct; in fact, the most adequate interpretation would—as Lejay did¹¹—synthesize these apparent alternatives into a coherent whole. Accordingly, the understanding of Horace's conclusion generally agrees with the words of Ritter: "*clam se inde discessisse poetice significavit*,"¹² where "*poetice*" is applied to the wealth of allusion which Lucilius' successor ingeniously develops from a line used by Lucilius in his typically witty and extravagant manner.

Synthesis of these three interpretations does not necessarily exhaust the potential allusions in Horace's line. Since economy is characteristic of Horace, it is tempting to speculate on other applications of his words, which would extend the scope of his poetic parody. Recently, E. T. Salmon, without denying the validity of the literary explanations hitherto advanced, has proposed an additional reference for *Apollo*.¹³ He believes that the Satire has consistent topographical allusions indicating various stages in Horace's progress towards Caesar's Gardens, the destination announced in 18. As we are told in the first line, Horace was walking along the Via Sacra when he was accosted by the *garrulus*. Later, he mentions arriving at the Temple of Vesta (line 35). Apart from these two specific references to sites in the Forum, Horace gives no further direct indication of the scene of action. Salmon, assuming quite plausibly that there are indirect indications, has suggested an attractive solution to the difficulty usually sensed in *tricesima sabbata* (l. 69)¹⁴ by interpreting the phrase as a subtle allusion to the Jewish Quarter

¹¹ *Op. cit.* in his excellent notes on line 78.

¹² F. Ritter, in his edition of the *Satires* (Leipzig, 1857), note on line 78.

¹³ E. T. Salmon, "Horace's Ninth Satire in its Setting," *Studies in Honor of Gilbert Norwood* (Toronto, 1952), pp. 184-93.

¹⁴ Cf. the efforts of interpretation in Orellius, *op. cit.*, and Lejay, *op. cit.* Because of the difficulty and the absence of any definite indications as to the significance of the phrase, Kiessling-Heinze, *op. cit.*, regard the words as devoid of factual application.

near the Forum Boarium. Horace, in this view, has moved out of the Forum Romanum, down the Vicus Tuscus, and into the Jewish residential area. Further, it was near here that the *garrulus* unexpectedly met his legal opponent. In the ensuing confusion, Horace escaped, to take refuge in the sanctuary of the patron of poets, as Salmon infers from the conclusion. *Apollo*, who signifies the god of justice and poetry, can also be considered topographically relevant, as applying to the Temple of Apollo Medicus, newly re-built by Sosius in the late Thirties B. C.¹⁵ In this type of interpretation, there is an opportunity to check the theory against facts. For this reason, Salmon has been challenged by the Roman topographer F. Castagnoli, who denies the allusions suggested and attempts to return to the limited interpretations listed above. *Apollo*, in fact, he restricts to its Homeric relevance, while he seems to regard the Lucilian parallel as coincidental. Accordingly, he states: "L'acceno ad Apollo non ha bisogno di un riferimento topografico, ma, come commenta Porfirione, e semplicemente una reminiscenza omerica (*Il. XX, 443*) citata anche de Lucilio."¹⁶ The present writer takes no position in this controversy; yet it is significant that the disagreement springs from the relevance or irrelevance of an admittedly allusive line.

Castagnoli's phrase "reminiscenza omerica" suggests still another method of interpreting *sic me servavit Apollo* and of defining the limits of Lucilius' influence upon this poem. In the first place, Horace translates Homer freely, whereas Lucilius cited him verbatim. When, then, Lucilius used the phrase, he was obliged to attach the Greek line to a Latin context; he was, we may say, aiming at the conflict between the Greek and Latin, between the epic and the satiric, the supernatural and the real. As if to mark the opposition clearly, Lucilius connected the Homeric words to his context in the form of a negative simile

¹⁵ There is a potential difficulty in dating the Satire as late as the building of Sosius' Temple, since the date of construction is often assigned to the year of Sosius' consulship. Salmon argues plausibly that the temple was erected in 33 B. C., as Shipley had already suggested. If so, there is no necessary conflict, since Book II of the *Satires* was written in the years 33-30 B. C.

¹⁶ F. Castagnoli, "Note di Topografia Romana," *Bull. Comm. Arch. Com.*, LXXIV (1952), p. 53.

(*nil ut discrepat ac*).¹⁷ The effect is to imply the inapplicability of the Homeric context to Lucilius' story, and, in my opinion, Fiske rightly concludes that the satirist was humorously referring to a frivolous situation, quite possibly the unwelcome presence of a bore.¹⁸ Such an inference would be consistent with what is known of Lucilius' treatment of Greek: his tendency to extravagance, but also his achievement of witty statements.¹⁹ By contrast, Horace assimilates the line of Homer to his context, makes himself the object instead of the non-personal τὸν, and alters ἐξήπαξεν to the more emotional *servavit*. These changes enable Horace to use *Apollo* more fully. In particular, the rejection of the simile as a method of using the reminiscence frees Horace from the necessity of a mechanical citation of Homer merely for purposes of witty contrast, permits him instead to adapt Homer with subtlety to his dramatic account.

The indirect method of citation, I suggest, makes Homer more relevant to Horace than to Lucilius. It is, therefore, necessary secondly to return to the context in Homer upon which Horace's phrase is based, to see what possible bearing it can have upon Horace's hypothetical experience with the bore.²⁰ At this point in Book XX of the *Iliad*, the epic poet describes the brief encounter between Hector and Achilles. Hector's efforts to wound Achilles are checked by Athena. As Achilles is rushing in for the kill, Apollo intervenes and carries the Trojan off in a cloud to safety. These details fit the traditional interpretation of Horace previously mentioned, namely, that the intervention of

¹⁷ The negative *nil*, not in Porphyrio, is added by Marx. Subsequent editors, however, have accepted the emendation: so Warmington and Terzaghi; and Fiske reads *nil*.

¹⁸ Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 335 rejects Marx's interpretation of the line. Marx imagined a situation in which somebody is badly beaten up and prays that he may be saved in the miraculous manner of Hector: "*ita enim pugnis et fustibus erat male mulcatus*." I doubt that Lucilius' use of Greek words was that subtle.

¹⁹ On the use of Hellenisms in Lucilius, cf. W. C. Korfmacher, "'Grecizing' in Lucilian Satire," *C. J.*, XXX (1935), pp. 453-62; also, M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos: zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römische Poesie* (Frankfurt, 1949), pp. 13 ff.

²⁰ I agree with the majority of scholars, who regard this Satire as based on an imaginary experience.

Apollo in the *Iliad* is humorously appropriate to his imagined rescue of the poet Horace. One factor, however, has been ignored: the original context is a battle scene. Apollo saves his favorite, who is a warrior, not a poet. On the surface, the basic martial context seems to have no bearing upon the drama here enacted, which plainly presents anything but warfare. But Horace has employed throughout *S.*, I, 9 a number of similar expressions, epic and martial, which can be related to the Homeric battle; when related, they assume form as a new level of meaning based on the significance of battle in this Satire, of Horace as a warrior. Further developed, this new pattern explains more specifically certain portions of the drama which have been viewed simply as humorous exaggerations. It can be shown, I believe, that Horace has treated the dramatic situation in a different manner from Lucilius, so as to utilize extensively the martial overtones of his Homeric original.

As Heinze noted, the first obvious statement of a military word occurs in 42-3, where Horace visualizes the bore as a conqueror (*victore*). If, however, this passage is patent, reinforced as it is by *contendere*, it is also anticipated at several earlier points, as Horace intimates his attitude towards his companion in terms applicable also to war. When the bore rushes up and seizes his hand, Horace implies that the act is an affront to him. The man does not sense the unfriendliness in Horace's overpolite reply to his own effusive greeting; he persists. Horace, therefore, determines to end the conversation immediately and bluntly says goodbye (6). The word suggesting bluntness, *occupo*, is more commonly employed in other senses. In its root meaning, it is a word of war: to seize, take possession of, and, by derivation, to begin the attack.²¹ By itself, the word might be simply humorous. Supported in the context by *arrepta*, which regularly has violent associations,²² it hints at a battle

²¹ For *occupare* with a personal object in a martial context, cf. *Aen.*, X, 699: *Latagum saxo atque ingenti fragmine montis / occupat os faciemque adversam*. Horace uses this word in *Epist.*, I, 7, 66 to signify abrupt address, though without any suggestion of the military theme.

²² There are four usages of *arripere* in Horace, all of them indicating violent activity. Three of them suggest the ferocity of animals. Cf. *A.P.*, 475, where *arripuit* is associated by simile with *ursus*. In *S.*, II, 1, 69 and 3, 224, the verb is characteristic of the satirist's invective.

theme which will gradually become clearer. In this sense, the opening lines could be visualized as the first stages of a personal combat between Horace and the bore. The man's attitude is aggressive (*arrepta*) and offensive to Horace, so, in desperation, Horace determines to fight (*occupo*). It is a strange type of battle. Longing only to escape, Horace tries every device he can invent to frighten or discourage the *garrulus*. No matter what he does or says, he is beaten; while, the *garrulus*, merely by forcing his company on the unfortunate poet, is regarded as an enemy in pursuit. In each passage of arms—an intolerable effusion from the *garrulus* followed by a desperate, though polite, reply from Horace—the bore emerges victorious, because he is completely obtuse to Horace's feelings and irresistibly persistent in his own crude designs. This nightmare battle,²³ perceived in the conflict of personalities, is fought by words. As the drama proceeds, it becomes more and more evident that the satirist treats the situation as a real combat between himself and his objectionable companion.

Part of the irony of the Satire depends upon the fact that the bore does not realize how offensive he is. When he praises himself as *doctus* (7), it is a painful wound (*misere*, 8) to a real poet. No longer willing to fight bravely face-to-face, Horace tries to break off the battle (*discedere*, 8).²⁴ The engagement becomes a running conflict, in which Horace periodically makes a futile gesture of resistance and attempts to discourage his pur-

Only *Epist.*, I, 7, 89 does not fit the metaphor. As for the phrase *arrepta manu*, it is quite possible that Horace is thinking of a line in Plautus and its violent associations: cf. *Curc.*, 597: *manum arripuit mordicus*. That the line is well-known is indicated by the fact that it is imitated by Turpilius (*Com.*, 108) and by Apuleius (*Met.*, VIII, 23). In short, the first view we have of the *garrulus* is carefully influenced by *arrepta*, so as to suggest his aggressiveness.

²³ I should like to have found support for my first impression, that the whole scene resembles Achilles' pursuit around the walls of Ilium in *Il.*, XXII; I do not now believe, however, that Horace justifies the connection.

²⁴ Horace uses *discedere* three times in this same military sense. Cf. *Epist.*, I, 7, 17: *victor violens discessit ab hoste*; also, *Epist.*, II, 2, 99, where he is describing the rivalry of critics, and *S.*, I, 7, 17, where he comments on the famous meeting of Glaucus and Diomedes in the *Iliad*. For the military meaning in general, cf. *T. L. L.*, s. v., § C. It appears in Caesar, e. g., *B. C.*, III, 112, 7, and Livy, e. g., IX, 44, 8.

suer. First, he tries to outdistance the man (*ire ocius*, 9); then, he stops to fight, makes a stand (*consistere*).²⁵ The martial sense of *consistere* and the normally poetic connotations of *ocius* are then combined with the context implied by *sudor* (10). On the dramatic level, Horace's sweating is an amusing exaggeration; an unpleasant conversation does make one perspire, but one is hardly bathed in sweat. In the *Iliad*, however, men sweat (*ἰδρὼς*) under the strain of combat when they are defeated and flee in terror, as Lycaon (XXI, 51); when they have been wounded;²⁶ and when they fight well, but against greater numbers.²⁷ The passage concerning Ajax and his battlesweat (XVI, 109) is a prototype for the description of Turnus, when he is hard-pressed within the encampment of the Trojans; and *ἰδρὼς* is the basis of *sudor* in Vergil.²⁸ After this, other intolerable remarks from the *garrulus* provoke the unspoken thought in Horace: *o te, Bolane, cerebri / felicem* (11-12). Horace wishes that he were choleric, that his temper frightened company; his exaggerated emotion, however, continues the overtone of epic warfare. Frequently, the epic hero cries out in a moment of crisis, envying the fortune of another, particularly his happy death in battle.²⁹ Similarly, Horace envies Bolanus, because a bad temper has always permitted the latter to escape from such predicaments as that which the poet faces.

Even the obtuse bore eventually perceives that Horace is trying to get away (14). Rather than permit this, he blatantly insists on accompanying his victim. As he puts it, Horace is helpless (*nil agis*, 15); he, the bore, will hold on to his man (*usque tenebo*); he will continue his pursuit (*persequar*, 16) wherever Horace goes. The militant overtone of *persequar* is unmistakable, and it tinges the other verbs. Confident of capturing Horace, the bore boasts that he will pursue him indefinitely. Still, Horace tries some strategy. He invents a friend

²⁵ Cf. *Aen.*, IX, 789: *agmine denso / consistunt*. For the military meaning in general, cf. *T. L. L.*, s. v., § I 2b. The word appears in Caesar, e. g., *B. G.*, II, 21, 6, and Livy, e. g., I, 27, 5.

²⁶ Cf. *Il.*, V, 796; XI, 811.

²⁷ Cf. *Il.*, XIII, 711; XVI, 109.

²⁸ *Aen.*, IX, 812.

²⁹ Cf. *Aen.*, XI, 159: *felix morte tua*. It is in a similar context that Aeneas voices his emotions: *o terque quaterque beati . . .* (I, 94).

far across the Tiber, a sick friend, whom he must visit (17-18). This ruse makes not the slightest impression on the dull wit of the fool. Instead of being discouraged by the prospective walk, he boasts of his energy and repeats his threat of constant pursuit: *non sum piger: usque sequar te* (19). The choice of *piger* is designed, for to be *piger* is to be unheroic.³⁰ When, however, the bore denies that he is *piger*, Horace is making him reveal his basic fault. A definite relation exists between his energetic eagerness and his offensiveness, to the extent that, concentrated on his own antipathetic purposes, the *garrulus* is blind to the reactions of others. With ill-concealed distaste, Horace resigns himself to the pursuit: he compares himself to an overburdened ass (20-1).³¹ Then, his companion sets out to ingratiate himself with the poet. Naturally, he chooses the most offensive approach, comparing himself to Hermogenes, the most obnoxious of poetasters in Horace's opinion (22-5). The stage directions are suggestive: *incipit ille* (21). As a verb of speech, *incipere* is generally associated with epic.³² Moreover, when the verb precedes its subject, the form resembles the emphatic technique of formal poetry. Implicitly, then, 22 ff. is introduced as an epic speech. At the end of 22, where it will receive stress, Horace has placed *amicum*, a word which is markedly ironic as applied to this person who antagonizes Horace with every word he speaks. Rather, the boasts uttered by this man render him *inimicum*, *hostem*. To me, there is a suggestion here of another aspect of battle. About to come to blows at last, our epic heroes praise themselves and threaten the enemy with reports of their fearsomeness. Horace interrupts the offensive chatter of the *garrulus* with his rejoinder (26-7). It is intended to use the sick friend as a threat. As it is put, though, the satirist seems to be reminding the bore of his fond relatives, warning him of the

³⁰ Cf. *Epist.*, II, 1, 124: *militiae quamquam piger et malus*. In fact, *piger* regularly denotes him who is unfit for military exploits. Cf. Cicero, *Fam.*, VII, 17, 1; Livy, XXI, 25, 6; Juvenal, 8, 248. By contrast, *impiger* connotes the zeal and energy necessary for war. Cf. *Carm.*, IV, 14, 22: *impiger hostium / vexare turmas*.

³¹ Tempting though it may be, the simile should not be taken as analogous to the epic simile in *Il.*, XI, 558 ff., describing Ajax in terms of an ass.

³² Cf. *Aen.*, VI, 103: *ut primum cessit furor et rabida ora quierunt, / incipit Aeneas heros*.

folly of attacking so mightily a hero as himself.³³ Thus, *salvo* (27) connotes not merely preservation from sickness, but safety in war.³⁴

Unfortunately, the bore frustrates Horace's fearsome threat. He has buried all his family, and there are no relatives to worry about his health. Horace can only envy the dead as *felices* (28), people who have died and fortunately escaped the fate he is undergoing (cf. 12). Now at last the hero realizes that he is doomed. Fatalistically he enters combat, requesting a quick finish (*confice*, 29).³⁵ Then begins the oracle which, as others have noted, is an epic parody.³⁶ To describe a passage as epic parody, however, does not reach the heart of the question, as this paper is attempting to demonstrate; while implying the humorous effect, it does not explain the function of the parody in its context. From acquaintance with Horatian economy, it would be reasonable to assume that the poet has used epic parody here because it is thematically functional, not merely for its witty impression. It is accordingly necessary to determine the epic context specifically relevant to this Satire. We have seen that the satirist regards his unwelcome companion, to a certain extent, as an enemy and therefore pictures himself as a warrior fighting a losing battle with him. Now, a situation suggests itself in which the satirist describes himself as the hero who suddenly remembers the prophecy of his death in battle at the moment of fulfilment. There are analogues in Homer. Ritter pointed to the oracle which Polyphemus recalled after being blinded.³⁷ On the whole, the context is not so appropriate as the more common use of oracles in

³³ Cf. the speech of Achilles to Aeneas in *Il.*, XX, 196.

³⁴ In two other cases, Horace uses *salvus* to apply to circumstances of war: cf. *Epist.*, I, 2, 10 and 16, 27.

³⁵ It will be noticed that Horace is practicing ellipsis regularly and has here omitted the direct object of *confice*. The conventional object would probably have been something like *negotium*, as it is interpreted in *T. L. L.*, s. v. § I A 2b. However, the ellipsis permits a personal subject, specifically *me*. To fit such a construction, there is a sense of *conficere* related to killing: cf. *T. L. L.*, s. v., § III E 1. Cf. Livy, VI, 13, 5: *iusta caede conficere hostem posset*.

³⁶ Cf. Orellius, Kirkland, Lejay, Morris, Fiske, Kiessling-Heinze, and others.

³⁷ *Od.*, IX, 507 ff.

the battle scenes of the *Iliad*. The phrase of introduction seems conclusive; yet, to my knowledge, no commentator has observed that the words *instat fatum me triste* (29) are a good translation of *Il.*, XXII, 303: *νῦν αὐτέ με μοῖρα κιχάνει*. The Greek acts as one of the formulaic phrases of Homer, in which any personal pronoun can be substituted, providing it is metrically equivalent.³⁸ Its context is always the death of a warrior. In the single instance where the personal pronoun is *με* and the parallel with the Latin is exact, Hector is the speaker. The hero realizes that he has been overcome by the gods and his own weakness; after speaking, he turns to face Achilles and meet the inevitable death. On the other hand, Hector does not mention a prophecy in his moment of realization; he is, so to speak, his own prophet. We must look to other portions of the *Iliad*, where the death of a warrior is foretold, but the formulaic phrase not used. For example, Polyidus foresaw the death of his own son;³⁹ Achilles hears his doom prophesied;⁴⁰ Aeneas is threatened with death by the supreme prophet, Apollo;⁴¹ and Achilles acts the prophet.⁴² Because of the negative manner of prophecy here exhibited and not illustrated in Homer, a different ancient analogue has been suggested.⁴³ Diogenes Laertius reports an epigram recited about Zeno the Stoic which has a similarly negative form.⁴⁴ Although the context of the epigram involves neither battle nor death, it is not impossible that Horace parodies the epigram as well as the epic. Curiously enough, Shakespeare provides the closest parallel of all in *Macbeth*. Deceived up to the last moment by the speciously convincing oracles, Macbeth sees one after the other fulfilled; finally, he meets Macduff and hears the nature of his enemy's birth. It is at this moment (Act V, Scene VII, line 59) that, certain of his death, he faces Macduff with those famous words: "Lay on, Macduff . . ." (cf. *confice*). Whatever may have been the exact source of

³⁸ Cf. *Il.*, XVII, 478 and 672; XXII, 436.

³⁹ *Il.*, XIII, 666.

⁴⁰ *Il.*, XIX, 409.

⁴¹ *Il.*, XX, 332.

⁴² *Il.*, XXI, 110.

⁴³ The credit for suggesting this new analogue, as Lejay notes, goes to Kiessling.

⁴⁴ *Lives*, VII, 27. The epigram is fully cited in Orellius, Kirkland, and Lejay.

Horace's passage—if there is a single source—epic gives the tone to the language. The circumstances in which the oracle was uttered (*cecinit*, 30) suggest epic grandeur. Moreover, the first line (31), containing the poetic *dira* and the archaic *hosticus* and concerned with the type of destiny associated with epic or tragedy, fits the mood of an oracle or formal, grand poetry. It is the irony of the prophecy to descend from tragic deaths, which it denies our hero, through more prosaic fates to the most ridiculous of all ends. Horace must perish ignobly at the hands of a *garrulus* (33). Still, suffering the fool's aggressiveness, while an ignominious fate, is significantly placed in the same context of hostility as a death in real battle would be. In fact, the anticlimactic end of the prophecy, with its mock-epic tmesis *quando . . . cumque* (33), reveals the weapon which, above all others, is deadly to Horace: meaningless verbosity. Accordingly, he criticizes Lucilius for talkativeness in *S.*, I, 4 and 10; he attacks Hermogenes for his lack of literary discipline in I, 2 and 3; and he sets up as his own great artistic ideal *brevitas*.⁴⁵ There is, then, no alternative: Horace is irrevocably doomed.

In terms of epic battle, the remainder of the Satire determines the fate of the doomed poet. Conquered now, he is granted his life and made a helpless prisoner. Possibilities of escape occur, are hopefully grasped, but as quickly forestalled by captor or fate. The first chance arises as a result of the lawsuit impending against the bore (33 ff.). On the basis of their mutual friendship, the fool asks Horace to stop a moment and give him support. Since this "friendship" (38) is viewed by the poet as enmity, he swears that he cannot and will not stop (*inteream*, 38). Villeneuve found problems in the traditional interpretation of the phrase *valeo stare* (39).⁴⁶ He rejected construing *stare* as equivalent to *adstare*⁴⁷ and, pointing to a common theory about Horace's delicate health, treated *stare* as a properly simple verb. According to this interpretation, Horace has not the strength to stand; there is no other implication. Limitations on the relevance of Horace's language, as 78 and the systematic connotations present in this Satire imply, generally result in the error which comes from eliminating important meanings.

⁴⁵ Cf. *S.*, I, 10, 9: *est brevitae opus*.

⁴⁶ F. Villeneuve, *Horace: Satires* (Paris, 1932), *loc. cit.*

⁴⁷ One might assume *adstare* on the basis of *ades* (36).

Quite probably, Horace has used the simple verb as a simple verb *and* for its compound.⁴⁸ Such usage would be consistent with economy, since the simple verb, not specifying the preposition in the compound, allows a moderate freedom of application. For instance, the legal context here suggests the prepositions *ad-* or *prae-*; but Horace's unhappy condition might well support *con-* or *prae-*, with their thematic relevance. The military metaphor, that is, cannot be totally disregarded. At any rate, Horace has no fight left; he certainly can no longer fight the presence of the bore. For a hopeful moment, the man hesitates as to whether to face his lost cause in court or retain Horace captive. The latter alternative seems preferable and, captor that he is, he leads off his victim (*praecedere*, 40). The poet cannot resist (*contendere*); he resigns himself and meekly follows the triumphant *garrulus* (*victore*, 41).

For the next fifteen lines, the dreadful predicament of the captive seems to be ignored. The two men converse about Maecenas, and the bore expresses his desire to be admitted into his select circle. If, however, the military theme is applied, it is not out of place. As Horace looks back upon this period, he compares it to supreme torture; he has been under the knife, he says (*sub cultro*, 74). With the poet in hand, the *garrulus* is considering a more valuable conquest, that of the great Maecenas himself. As an instrument of his campaign, he will employ Horace. Therefore, he keeps threatening the poet, in order to make him pliable to his designs. When the man reveals his plot upon Maecenas, he also discloses an aspect of his character which has so far only been implicit: he is not only antagonistic because of his chatter; he is also highly aggressive, in fact unscrupulous in the pursuit of his ambitions. These two qualities are complementary in his personality, to be sure, but aggressiveness does not necessarily follow from talkativeness. Impelled as he is by ambition, the fool makes the egregious error of

⁴⁸ The exact implication conveyed when a simple word is used for its compound varies according to the context. Frequently, abbreviation of this type has informal connotations and is congenial to satire. Cf. E. Wölflin, "Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein," *Philol.*, XXXIV (1876), pp. 149 ff.; F. Ruckdeschel, *Archaismen und Vulgarismen in der Sprache des Horaz* (Diss. Munich, 1910), pp. 25 ff.; A. Engel, *De Q. Horati Flacci Sermonibus Metro Accomodato* (Diss. Breslau, 1914), pp. 68 ff.

attributing the same aggressive traits to Horace, and, under this illusion, he appeals to the poet by the crude motives influencing his own manner. Since Horace is a good friend of Maecenas, he assumes that Horace has consciously seized opportunities (*fortuna*, 45)⁴⁹ to pretend the sort of friendship which makes use of a powerful political figure. So begins Horace's torture. Fortune governs the military sphere as well as the political, at least when one is crudely ambitious. In as much, then, as the poet already has the advantages of Fortune, the *garrulus* devises a campaign which will depend on Horace's Fortune and will have as its object the capture of similar Fortune. To begin with, he speaks of himself as a potential *adiutor* (46) of Horace's ambition. The metaphor in *adiutor*, ambiguous in its clause, quickly acquires a precise meaning as a result of the definite stage metaphor in *ferre secundas*. Since, however, it precedes the specific dramatic image, it might also possess momentarily a valid military significance. If so, the *garrulus* first proposes himself as Horace's aide-de-camp,⁵⁰ then requests a supporting role in the play where Horace takes the lead. The plan of operations is simple: the poet will introduce the *garrulus* to Maecenas.⁵¹ The word used for "introduce," *tradere* (47), is the equivalent of *commendare*.⁵² It is not unlikely, however, that the word betrays the aggressive nature of the speaker by suggesting also a military overtone. By this interpretation, a scene could be imagined where, introduced into the fortified city, the enemy overcomes all resistance (*summosses*, 48)⁵³ and treacherously seizes power from within. At this point, thoroughly antagonized by such shameless effrontery, Horace protests at the schemer's misconceptions. There is no truth in the belief that Maecenas' circle has political importance; rather,

⁴⁹ I interpret the ellipsis, with most editors, as implying *te*, not *illo*.

⁵⁰ Cf. Livy, X, 26, 2: *adiutorem belli sociumque imperii darent*.

⁵¹ Though it would be convenient for the image to have *hunc hominem* refer to Maecenas, one must interpret the phrase, following Porphyrio, as a familiar expression probably accompanied by a gesture, as the *garrulus* points to himself.

⁵² Cf. *Epist.*, I, 18, 76-8, where Horace uses *commendare* and *tradere* in the same sense.

⁵³ Cf. Caesar, *B. G.*, I, 25: *victis ac summotis resisterent*; also, *B. G.*, VIII, 10.

it is opposed to unscrupulous climbing: *his aliena malis* (50).⁵⁴ Just as the fool's ways arouse the antagonism of Horace, so his ambition only earns the hostility of the artistic circle to which the poet belongs.

Horace's protests only fire the man's desire to win the favor of Maecenas. When the fool applies to himself the metaphor *accendis* (53), Horace immediately construes it in its military sense and completes the ellipsis mentally to read: "you fire my courage." Carrying on in the same vein, the satirist now openly uses the military metaphor as proper to his companion's manner. As he ironically puts it, nothing could withstand the persistence of such a person; the man will take Maecenas by storm (*expugnabis*, 55) in an easy victory (*vinci*). In this metaphorical context, *virtus* (54) also reverts to its original meaning of manliness, fitness for war. Once again, by its striking incongruity, the image stresses the moral significance of the Satire. The bore is aggressive and offensive: that constitutes his *virtus*. Because, however, his aggressiveness springs from crude personal ambition, devoid of any trace of honor, his *virtus* must fall far short of the epic ideal. Therefore, too, the military theme will always be an ironic suggestion of the schemer's ignobility. With this implication, Horace continues: there are strategic approaches (*aditus*, 56), he says, to Maecenas' city, but difficult and well-guarded. Completely missing Horace's irony and taking his cue from the military metaphor, the schemer openly parades his methods and his scale of values: he will use bribery on the guards (*corrumpam*, 57). If the gates are shut on him and, like a lover, he is ignored (*exclusus*, 58), he will remain true to his character: he will not give up. Awaiting his opportunity, he will attack his man in the street (*occurram*, 59),⁵⁵ force a meeting. He will impose himself on Maecenas as an escort; he will, in other words, lead Maecenas captive just as he is now leading Horace (*deducam*).⁵⁶ Then, as if to summarize his

⁵⁴ Lejay glosses *aliena*: "hostile, contraire." For the meaning "hostile," cf. *T. L. L.*, s. v., § II A 2.

⁵⁵ For the use of *occurrere* in a military sense, cf. Lucretius, III, 524: *falsae rationi vera videtur / res occurrere et effugium praecludere*; also, Lucretius, VI, 32. In Caesar, cf. *B. C.*, I, 40 and III, 92: *ipsi immissis telis occurrissent*. Cf. also *Aen.*, X, 734.

⁵⁶ Prof. H. T. Rowell has pointed out to me a second Horatian usage

energetic character, he recites the noble truism, which he has perverted to his own purposes:

nil sine magno
vita labore dedit mortalibus. (59-60)

As Heinze noted, the saying originated in the dignified Greek oracular proverb:

οὐδὲν ἄνευ καμάτου πέλει ἀνδράσιν εὐπετὲς ἔργον.

It is perhaps significant that the unscrupulous *garrulus* has perverted the neat hexameter unit as well as the moral basis of the original.

The greater offensive of the schemer has now been exposed; Horace remains in his predicament. At this juncture, Fuscus Aristius comes up—as Horace hopefully believes—to the attack (*occurrit*, 61; cf. 59). The warriors, prepared for battle, make a stand (*consistimus*, 62; cf. 9). By every means in his power, Horace tries to show his longing for rescue (*eriperet*, 65), gesticulating, nudging, going through a series of facial contortions. Aristius pretends obtuseness. Furious yet helpless, Horace describes his desperation in physical terms: *meum iecur urere bilis* (66). Though by no means an exact parallel, there is a possible reminiscence here, I suggest, of Homeric phrases used to denote deep feeling, such as *χόλον θυμαλγέα*.⁵⁷ When subtle methods bring no result, Horace is obliged to speak out. He reminds Aristius of an important message which requires privacy (67-8). It is amusing to tease, and Aristius refuses to co-operate, alleging a flimsy excuse (68-71). With a cry of frustration, the intensity of which suggests epic emotionality, the poor satirist curses his evil day: *solem / tam nigrum* (72-3). After Aristius has fled from battle with the bore (*fugit*, 73), he is doomed. The phrase *sub cultro*, according to Porphyrio, is a well-known proverb. Unfortunately, this proverb is used once in extant Latin literature, in this passage.⁵⁸ Most commentators

of *deducere* in this meaning of leading in triumph: *Carm.*, I, 37, 31: *scilicet invidens / privata deduci superbo / non humilis mulier triumpho*. For the general military sense, cf. *T. L. L.*, s. v., § I A 2f. With this significance, it is used in Caesar, e. g., *B. G.*, III, 38, and Livy, e. g., XXVIII, 32, 7.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Il.*, IX, 260.

⁵⁸ Cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), p. 100; also, the article on *cultro* in *T. L. L.*

gloss the phrase: "as a sacrificial victim." It seems likely that this interpretation should be accepted, for the *culter* was most commonly used as a sacrificial knife and victims were put under the knife.⁵⁹ In Ovid's time, though, the *culter* could be spoken of as a weapon also; and by 50 A. D. the short sword of the gladiator was sometimes called *culter*. There is, then, considerable justification for interpreting the victim under the knife as human and accepting Heinze's ingenious gloss: "wie ein wehrloses *Schlachtopfer*, bereit, den Todesstoss zu empfangen."⁶⁰ At this point, Horace's predicament seems desperate indeed.

Suddenly, another warrior (*adversarius*, 75) arrives on the scene, to contest the way (*obvius*, 74). As he recognizes his enemy, the newcomer hails the *garrulus* with a curse, takes the willing Horace as witness, and drags his man violently off to trial. In this final scene, the description is very allusive, and the poet uses his economic device of ellipsis to advantage (77-8). Although specifically he is depicting the uproar occasioned by the cursing *adversarius*, the resisting *garrulus*, and the crowd of spectators, he also succeeds in suggesting a scene of battle. Possibly, one might think of an episode such as that in the *Iliad*, when the Greeks and Trojans fight over the body of Patroclus. Wherever the battle is hottest, the most men are involved, and reinforcements are continually pouring in. The *garrulus*, by nature antagonistic, must be the center of battle, and when he is dragged off, his victim Horace, a naturally peaceful individual, is left in tranquillity. The uproar (*clamor utrimque*, 77) is similar to the thunder of battle in the *Iliad* (*ὄρνυμάγδος*). When the curious onlookers run up (*concursum*, 78),⁶¹ there is a general confusion like that of a violent engagement. Rescued from battle at last, free of the intolerable aggressiveness of the

⁵⁹ Cf. *Aen.*, VI, 248: *supponunt alii cultros tepidumque cruorem / suscipiunt pateris*; also *Georg.*, III, 492.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Trist.*, V, 7, 19: *dextera non segnis fixo dare vulnera cultro*. Seneca mentions the use of the *culter* by gladiators in *Epist.*, 87, 9. In his note on the passage, Heinze associates the phrase with the obvious military metaphor of 43, *victore*.

⁶¹ For the military application of *concursum*, cf. *T. L. L.*, s. v., § 12. There is a curious parallel to *clamor utrimque*, / *undique concursus* in Cicero, *Tusc.*, II, 37: *quid? exercitatio legionum, quid? ille concursus, concursus, clamor, quanti laboris est?* Cf. also Livy, XXII, 19, 12: *pertinaci certamine et concursu*.

garrulus, Horace thinks of Apollo as his protector. Apollo has saved him, indeed, from a struggle as ominous for him as the hopeless conflict between Achilles and Hector. Unlike Hector, the satirist is not snatched away (*ἐξήραξεν* = *eriperet*, 65); instead, his enemy is carried off (*rapit*), and he himself remains safe.

None of this elaboration of the battle and war symbolism in I, 9 negates the validity of the factual interpretations or the perceptive comments made by previous scholars in regard to this poem. At most, it questions what should always be questioned in the criticism of poetry: dogmatic, absolute assertions of a single specific interpretation, limiting Horace at points where he appears to have been deliberately unspecific and suggestive. On the positive side, it serves to explain some of the intricacy of Horace's technique. The observation has long since been made, for instance, that the satirist frequently uses military metaphors.⁶² In *S.*, I, 9, this practice can be explained as systematic and economic development of the moral insight of the poet. In an ordinary situation, a meeting between a typically contented, unambitious, sensitively artistic writer and an unwelcome, pushing poetaster, the satirist perceives, through his controlled irony, the elements of epic battle. The point of contact between the described event and the imagined overtones of war is the personality of the *garrulus*, which, being thoroughly objectionable, motivates the action of the drama. The man is *aggressive*; he makes himself *offensive*; he arouses *antagonism* in Horace. These metaphorical terms epitomize the relation between drama and battle, the relation which Horace is subtly stressing in his account. At no time does it appear that the action is sacrificed to the symbol. Where the symbol pushes forward, as in the exaggerated descriptions of Horace's feelings (10, 12, 28, 66, 72), the oracle (29-34), or the unambiguous metaphors (42, 55, 73), it is always nicely blended in the attractive irony of the satirist. But humor in Horace is not usually uneconomical or un-moral. It is his genius to suggest much without asserting and without ever distorting his dramatic setting. In *S.*, I, 9, accordingly, he has expressed his insight into

⁶² F. Bäker, *Die Metaphern in den Satiren des Horaz* (Stralsund, 1883), p. 20.

the character of a typical man by ironically identifying an aggressive personality with the heroic standards of epic. The incongruity is subtly controlled, maintained throughout the poem. To fit it neatly to his drama, the satirist depicts himself as the unfortunate warrior, fatally inferior to the aggressor, whose doom, long since prophesied, is now at last brought almost to fulfilment before our eyes. Only the providential intervention of Apollo saves him. It is perhaps doubtful that *Apollo* can be identified with a specific Roman monument of Apollo. It does, however, appear certain that Horace is speaking of the Apollo of mythology and literature, the god of poetry and justice, the character in Lucilius' clever, but limited, parody, and the deity whom Homer originally described as intervening to save Hector. Only Horace could devise a poem in which he subtly condemned Lucilius' use of Greek words and uneconomic parody by taking a specific line borrowed by his predecessor from Homer and using it more dexterously. The martial context of the *Iliad*, admirably adapted to the ordinary incident here dramatized, extends the significance of the Satire and reveals the maturity of Horace at this relatively early stage in his poetic career.

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

DEMONAX, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΝΤΙΝΕΩΝ.

About forty years ago there was published a papyrus fragment of Heracleides Lembos, *Epitome of Hermippus*, Περὶ νομοθετῶν,¹ which contained a short passage on the famous Mantineian lawgiver, Demonax. It seemed to reveal nothing more about Demonax than had already been known from the existing fragmentary sources except that it had a puzzling reference to the lawgiver as βασιλεύς. This term, I believe, has not only been misinterpreted by the scholars who have dealt with it, but as a result some have unjustly charged Heracleides with carelessness and have impugned his authority to a considerable degree; by their misinterpretation they have been forced to argue that this detail is not in agreement with the other sources and so must be due to Heracleides' error. The interpretation I propose here may not merely obviate such difficulties but also clarify the other sources particularly in regard to the significance of Demonax' legislation at Cyrene.

Twice in the papyrus fragment Demonax is called βασιλεύς, once at the beginning of the brief passage concerning his career: Δημω|ναξ ο βασι|λε|υς Μαντι|νεων (lines 19 ff.), and again several lines below: [Μαντιν]εων [βα]σιλευς | [ο Δημω]ναξ (lines 27 f.). In all the other sources the lawgiver is not known by such a title. Our earliest source, Herodotus (IV, 161), discussing the monarchy at Cyrene, relates that in order to settle a stasis in the reign of Battus III (the Lamé) the Delphic oracle advised the Cyrenaeans to ask Mantinea for a mediator (καταρτιστήρ) and in response to the request the Mantineians sent Demonax, ἄνδρα τῶν ἀσπῶν δοκιμώτατον. A similar account is given by Diodorus (VIII, 30, 2): ὅτι τῆς τῶν Κυρηναίων στάσεως διαιτητὴς ἐγένετο Δημῶναξ Μαντινεύς, συνέσει καὶ δικαιοσύνη δοκῶν διαφέρειν. A third reference to Demonax is to be found in a passage of Athenaeus (IV, 154d), who mentions as his source the same work of Hermippus (= frag. 1 in *F. H. G.*, III, 36) that Heracleides epitomized: "Ερμιππος δ' ἐν α' περὶ νομοθετῶν τῶν μονομαχοῦντων εὐρετὰς ἀποφαίνει Μαντινεῖς Δημώνακτος ἐνὸς τῶν

¹ B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XI (London, 1915), 1367, usually cited as *P. Oxy.*, 1367.

πολιτῶν συμβουλευσάντος καὶ ζηλωτὰς τούτων γενέσθαι Κυρηναίων. The only other reference to Demonax is to be found in a fragment of Ephorus quoted by Athenaeus (IV, 154d-e = frag. 97 in *F. H. G.*, I, 261 = frag. 54 in *F. Gr. H.*, II A 70) immediately following the remarks drawn from Hermippus. Although Demonax is here called Demeas, there can be little doubt that the two names refer to the same person.² In any case this passage does not have any reference to the status of the famous Mantineaean and so it may be disregarded for our purposes.

In publishing the papyrus fragment of Heracleides Lembos, Grenfell and Hunt (*op. cit.*, p. 115) have commented: "Hermippos disagreed with Herodotus, who is cited in l. 36, and later authorities in describing Demonax as king of Mantinea." And again (p. 118): "According to all these passages [i.e., Herodotus, Diodorus, and Athenaeus using Hermippus] Demonax was a private citizen, and it is strange that he should here be given the title of king." Suffice it at this point to remark that in the former comment it is assumed that Heracleides represented his source faithfully; thus Hermippus is considered to be at variance with Herodotus, Diodorus, and Athenaeus; and perhaps the same assumption is made in the latter comment although Grenfell and Hunt may rather be questioning the reliability of Heracleides by implication. Likewise, W. M. Edwards,³ in discussing this papyrus fragment, reveals his per-

² See Jacoby's commentary *ad loc.* (*F. Gr. H.*, II C, p. 53) and Stähelin's article in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Damonax," Suppl. III, col. 325. Stähelin fails to mention the papyrus fragment although his article was not published until 1918, after the publication of the papyrus fragment; perhaps the conditions of World War I prevented his consulting the papyrus publication of Grenfell and Hunt. Also, no reference to the papyrus fragment is made either by Daebritz in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Heracleides Lembos," cols. 488-91, or by Heibges, *ibid.*, s. v. "Hermippos, der Kallimacheer," cols. 845-52, since their articles appeared in 1912, before the publication of the papyrus. In regard to the correct (i.e., the Doric) form of the lawgiver's name see G. Fougères, *Mantinee et l'Arcadie orientale* (*Bibl. Éc. Franc.*, fasc. LXXVIII [Paris, 1898]), p. 333, n. 3 and p. 334, n. 5, and E. S. G. Robinson, *BMC Cyrenaica* (London, 1927), pp. liv, 26, and 34, where the name is noted on fourth-century coins; also *S. E. G.*, IX, 1, no. 50, lines 46, 147, and 231. Of course, the Doric dialect is best confirmed by Mantineaean inscriptions; e. g. see *I. G.*, V, 2, 261: δαμοργό[ν] (line 9) and δᾶμων (line 11).

³ "Διάλογος, Διατριβή, Μελέτη," in J. U. Powell and A. E. Barber

plexity at the apparent inconsistency of the evidence about "Demonax, the law-giver of the Cyrenaeans, who is styled 'King of the Mantineans,' instead of merely ἄνδρα τῶν ἀστών δοκιμώτατον, as Herodotus calls him (iv. 161)."

Even stronger and more pointed are the observations this new evidence has evoked from Maria Calderini Mondini:⁴ "Si può però con sicurezza affermare che o Ermippo stesso o il suo epitomatore si sono ingannati," and again: "E che questo sia un errore, anzi un errore che risale semplicemente all' epitomatore, e chiaramente dimostrato anche da un frammento del primo libro di Ermippo, riportato da Ateneo (IV, p. 154) che riguarda appunto Demonatte." Similarly A. Körte⁵ argues: "Auch Herodot, den Herakleides Z. 36 zitiert, und Diod. VIII: 30, 2 nennen ihn nicht König; es muss also eine Flüchtigkeit des Herakleides vorliegen." Most recently they have been followed by H. Bloch⁶ who states quite confidently: "The carelessness of Herakleides is obvious everywhere: . . . he is definitely wrong in twice calling the lawgiver Demonax 'king of Mantinea' (lines 20 and 27), because according to Hermippos himself F 1 (*F. H. G.*, III. 36 = *Ath.* IV. 154d) and according to Herodotus IV. 161 (whom Herakleides himself cites in line 36, following Hermippos), Demonax was a private citizen of Mantinea." Thus Herakleides is held responsible for misrepresenting Hermippus.

The one, and apparently not very obvious, point that has been overlooked in this question is that βασιλεύς need not be interpreted 'king' or 'monarch.' In all the above arguments it was assumed without question that this was the only interpretation; hence the conclusions that either Herakleides or Hermippus was in error. It is well attested, however, that the term βασιλεύς was retained as the title of a political official not only in Athens but in many other Greek states, where the re-

(edd.), *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Second Series (Oxford, 1929), p. 100.

⁴ "Intorno al P. Oxy. 1367," *R. Accademia Scientifico-letteraria in Milan: Studi della Scuola Papirologica*, III (1920), p. 113.

⁵ "Referate: Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der Christlichen," *Arch. Pap.*, VII (1924), p. 232.

⁶ "Herakleides Lembos and his *Epitome* of Aristotle's *Politeiai*," *T. A. P. A.*, LXXI (1940), p. 36.

ligious functions had originally been in the hands of an hereditary monarch.⁷ Aristotle (*Pol.*, 1289 b 9 ff.) has clearly pointed up the trichotomy in the functions of the early Greek kings, one of the functions being the administration of religious matters: κύριοι δ' ἦσαν τῆς τε κατὰ πόλεμον ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ὅσαι μὴ ἱερατικαὶ καὶ πρὸς τούτοις τὰς δίκας ἔκρινον, and similarly (1285 b 23 f.): στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος. In states where the powers of the sovereign monarch were diminished, the sacral functions were usually left in the hands of the monarch. This seems to be the origin of the office of βασιλεὺς: with the abolition of sovereignty and monarchical prerogative the kingship was transformed into an office, and often life-tenure also ended with the hereditary monarchy which gave way to an elective office with limited tenure.⁸ There was such an official called βασιλεὺς in charge of the sacral functions at Chios, Siphnos, Ios, Naxos, Miletos and her colony, Olbia, as well as at Athens; sometimes the official with this title was important enough to be eponymous as at Argos, Megara, her two colonies at Chalcedon and Chersonesos, and Samothrace.⁹

⁷ See Arist., *Pol.*, 1322 b 29: "Among religious offices is one devoted to the administration of the public festivals not assigned specifically to the priests; such officials are called Archons by some, Basileis by others, and Prytaneis by others" (καλοῦσι δ' οἱ μὲν ἀρχοντας τούτους, οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς, οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις). It is also interesting to note the only entry in Hesychius, s. v. βασιλεὺς· ἀρχων τις Ἀθήνησιν, μυστηρίων προνοῶν.

⁸ The office of the Athenian archon hardly needs comment; convenient summaries of the evidence on it are given by von Schoeffer in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Basileus," cols. 71 f., and G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*³ (Müller Hdb., IV, 1 [München, 1920-1926]), II, pp. 791 ff., 976, 1019 f., 1070 ff., 1089 ff., and 1183 ff. A convenient account of his functions is given by Pollux, VIII, 90. Fustel de Coulange in Daremberg-Saglio, s. v. "regnum (βασιλεία)," col. 827, remarks on the similarity in the development of the office of *rex sacrorum* at Rome: "Les Romains, pas plus que les Grecs, ne crurent pouvoir abolir cet antique pouvoir sacerdotal que l'on appelait la royauté. Les Grecs eurent toujours un βασιλεὺς, les Romains eurent un *rex*, même dans le régime républicain. Seulement, ce roi n'eut plus que les attributions religieuses, et on l'appela *rex sacrorum* ou *sacrificulus*." Another parallel drawn is that the wife of the *rex sacrorum* was called *regina* just as the Athenian archon's wife was called βασιλίσσα.

⁹ See Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatsk.*³, I, p. 348, and also von Schoeffer in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Basileus," col. 71. Arkesine (on Amorgos) and Samothrace are believed to have borrowed the institution from Athens.

Of these states Argos calls for special attention because of the influence she may have had on Mantinea and her institutions. In tradition Argos is credited with the synoecism of Mantinea, but it is difficult to establish with certainty that the synoecism precedes the floruit of Demonax (ca. 550 B. C.).¹⁰

¹⁰ The floruit of Demonax can be dated only from the reign of Battus III which falls roughly in the middle of the sixth century. No exact dating is possible even for the reign of Battus III. See esp. F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Bibl. Éc. Franc., fasc. CLXXVII [Paris, 1953]), pp. 138 ff. and esp. p. 151, n. 2, and p. 210; cf. also Stähelin in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Demonax," Suppl. III, col. 325, and K. J. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*² (Strassburg, Leipzig, and Berlin, 1912-1927), I, 2, p. 215. In regard to the synoecism of Mantinea, Bölte in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Mantinea," col. 1319 seems to favor the larger number who date it in the fifth century, mostly between 464 and 459 (the Helot secession to Ithome): E. Meyer, *Gesch. des Alt.*² (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1907), II, pp. 516 and 588 f.; Fougères, *Mantinee*, pp. 372 ff.; F. Hiller von Gaertringen in *I. G.*, V, 2, 47; Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatsk.*³, II, p. 1396, although Busolt alone in his *Gr. Gesch.*² (Gotha, 1893-1904), III, 1, pp. 118 f., had preferred a date just after the battle of Plataea; B. Keil in *Gött. Nachr.*, 1895, pp. 358 f., suggests ca. 450 (Spartan-Argive alliance) as the *terminus ante quem*. On the other hand G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*² (London, 1888), II, pp. 355 f., and Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*², I, 1, p. 335, date the synoecism at the beginning of the sixth century and before the Mantineians entered the Peloponnesian League. The only evidence for the event is to be found in Strabo (VIII, 337) who points out only that Mantinea was synoecized from five *demoi* by the Argives, whereas there is a great deal more on the fourth-century dioecism (see Xen., *H. G.*, V, 2, 7; Harpocration, s. v. *Μαντινέων διοικισμός* = Ephorus, frag. 138 in *F. H. G.*, I, 272 = frag. 79 in *F. Gr. H.*, II A 70; Isocr., *Paneg.*, 126 and *Pax*, 100). Both Grote and Beloch consider the synoecism of Mantinea a countermove by Argos to offset the synoecism of Tegea by Sparta (Paus., VIII, 45, 1; Strab., VIII, 337). The fact that Argos had a part in the synoecism would make it more likely that it occurred before rather than after the Persian Wars because Mantinea was on the best of terms with Sparta during the Arcadian revolt (ca. 470) and Third Messenian War (Hdt., IX, 35; Xen., *H. G.*, V, 2, 3). The same point may perhaps be confirmed by the fact that Mantinea coinage began as early as ca. 500 B. C.; see B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*² (Oxford, 1911), p. 449, and also P. Gardner, *Hist. of Anc. Coinage* (Oxford, 1918), p. 378, where Peloponnesian cities are noted to have been generally slow in striking coinage. Still the evidence is somewhat insufficient to date the synoecism with certainty in the first half of the sixth century. The question also arises whether such an office as the *βασιλεία* would necessarily precede rather than follow the synoecism of a polis; but in the case of Mantinea it seems that the influence of Argos cannot be disregarded.

The evidence would admit both an early sixth-century and a mid-fifth-century date. Yet it is hard to imagine that Mantinea escaped the influence of her neighbor, Argos, who headed a powerful Amphictyony in the sixth century and earlier.¹¹ Also, the Argives are known to have restricted the power of the monarchy from very early times so that their kings, though holding office for life, had approximately the same functions as the βασιλεύς in charge of the religious administration of other Greek states.¹²

In the light of these facts it is highly probable that there was such an official at Mantinea. This probability may be further confirmed by the reassurance that Demonax' title of βασιλεύς, as now interpreted, need not present any disagreement or inconsistency with what Herodotus, Diodorus, or Athenaeus have to say about the Mantineian. In Herodotus ἀνδρα τῶν ἀστῶν δοκιμώτατον simply points to the fact that Demonax was a Mantineian with a great reputation and therefore considered a suitable choice by the Mantineians to restore order at Cyrene. Similarly in Diodorus Demonax is described as Μαντινεύς, συνέσει καὶ δικαιοσύνη δοκῶν διαφέρειν: his appointment as arbitrator

¹¹ Paus., IV, 5, 2 and Hdt., VI, 92. See further Cauet in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Amphiktyonia," col. 1905.

¹² Paus., II, 19, 2: "Since the Argives have loved political equality and self-government (ἰσηγορίαν καὶ τὸ αὐτόνομον) from very early times, they reduced the power of their kings to a minimum, so that Medon, the son of Keisos, and his descendants were left a kingship in name only." In the same passage Pausanias notes that all the kings of Argos were descended from the Heraclid Temenos (cf. Plut., *De Alex. fort.*, 340 c) and that the last of the line was Meltas. That the constitutional monarchy lasted well into the fifth century is clear from Hdt., VII, 149, where the question of military leadership is also involved. A fifth-century inscription shows the βασιλεύς, called Melantas, was an eponymous official. See W. Vollgraff, *Le décret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tylissos* (*Verhandeling Akad. Wetensch.*, LI, 2 [Amsterdam, 1948]), pp. 84-6, who considers the name, Meltas, a corrupt reading for Melantas in the original text of Pausanias and so dates the end of the Argive Heraclids between 450 and 431 B. C., when dating by the priestess of Hera came into vogue (Thuc., II, 2). Thus the position of βασιλεύς at Argos must have been an hereditary office, but so far as is known it never developed into an annual magistracy. Of course, the career of the Heraclid Pheidon is generally recognized as a reaction against the limitations suffered by the Argive monarchy and a short-lived attempt to restore it to its former power.

(*δαιτητής*) at Cyrene is justified by his preeminent reputation for sagacity and fairness. The Cyrenaeans would thus have reason to expect a settlement which would not only be impartial but would also have the necessary qualities to secure a lasting harmony so desirable in the state.

Turning lastly to Athenaeus, we should notice particularly that, although he mentions Hermippus as his source, he is most certainly not quoting Hermippus directly. What he gives us of Hermippus could at best be an indirect quotation as is shown by the syntax with the verb ἀποφαίνει. This distinction would perhaps be more vivid and unmistakable if a comparison were made with the syntax of the next sentence in Athenaeus, where he quotes Ephorus directly as is shown by the syntax with the verb φησί. Moreover, if this so-called fragment of Hermippus is examined more closely, it becomes quite apparent that Athenaeus has not quoted Hermippus even indirectly, but has rather epitomized him. And it is from their failure to discern this that the above-mentioned critics (especially Calderini Mondini and Bloch) have fallen into the error of assuming that Heracleides' epitome could be compared with the actual words of Hermippus.

Now at Mantinea the reputation of Demonax must have rested to some extent on his service to the state in advising the Mantineians to take up duelling. By simply adding that the Cyrenaeans emulated the Mantineians in this practice, Athenaeus, it must be inferred, has omitted the necessary connection between these two otherwise isolated facts, i. e., that Demonax instituted the same practice at Cyrene. Nor is this the only omission, for Athenaeus, in compressing the data in Hermippus, has also omitted the fact that the Delphic oracle had advised the Cyrenaeans to ask Mantinea for a legislator. That this reference to Delphi was in the lost original of Hermippus can be confirmed from the papyrus fragment of Heracleides,¹³ and certainly this point is needed to make the connection between Demonax and Cyrene. With such a lacuna in Athenaeus it follows that he too epitomized Hermippus.

This reconstruction, to be sure, assumes Hermippus' original

¹³ This is shown by line 23: [ε]ς Δελφους, and esp. by lines 34-9:
με|[μ]νηται και του Δ[η]μου|[να]κτος και Ηροδο[το]ς| [ως υ]πο Μαν[τρ]ινε-
 μ[ο]
[ων]>|[δο]θειη Κυ[ρη]ναιοις εκ| [θε]οπροπιου νοθ[ε]ρης.

followed a chronological order in the account of Demonax' career. But if objections to this assumption may be anticipated, let us consider that Hermippus did not mention Demonax' service to Mantinea until he mentioned that the Cyrenaeans emulated the Mantineians in duelling; it would still be necessary to link up the two (apparently isolated) ideas presented by Athenaeus, i.e., (1) that the Mantineians at Demonax' advice originated the practice of duelling, and (2) that the Cyrenaeans emulated them in this. The necessary link is the rôle Demonax played in instituting the practice among the Cyrenaeans. Again it must be concluded that there is a lacuna in Athenaeus, and the lacuna must be due to the fact that Hermippus has been epitomized rather than quoted by Athenaeus. Yet even if this were not true, it would certainly be inaccurate to conclude, as Bloch has done, that this passage in Athenaeus contradicts the papyrus fragment of Heracleides merely because the former calls Demonax one of the citizens of Mantinea (ἐνὸς τῶν πολιτῶν) while the latter calls him βασιλεὺς Μαντινέων; for surely the former term may only be generic, the latter specific. Let us carry the point further. Is it not probable that Heracleides the epitomator was more specific than Athenaeus as epitomator?

Still another argument may be offered in support of the interpretation proposed for βασιλεὺς Μαντινέων. This may best be presented by an examination of the only legislation known to have been enacted by Demonax. Herodotus (IV, 161), our only source on his legislation, relates that in addition to enrolling the people of Cyrene in three phylai,¹⁴ Demonax τῷ βασιλεῖ Βάττῳ τεμένεια ἐξελὼν καὶ ἱερωσύνας, τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχεν οἱ βασιλῆες ἐς μέσον τῷ δήμῳ ἔθηκε. The interpretations of τεμένεια have not been altogether in agreement,¹⁵ but from the context

¹⁴ The number being the same as that of the Dorian phylai suggests that we have here another detail illustrating the influence of homeland institutions on Demonax' legislation.

¹⁵ Cf. J. P. Thrige, *Res Cyrenensium* (Hafniae, 1828), p. 150, who interprets the term as "agrorum sacrorum redditus"; K. O. Müller, *Die Dorier* (Breslau, 1844), III, 9, p. 13: "die Einkünfte von priesterlichen Funktionen und ihren Gütern"; Fougères, *Mantinee*, p. 334: "les revenus de certaines propriétés sacrées et l'exercice de quelques sacerdoces"; Grote, *Hist. of Greece*², III, p. 460: "all the domains, doubtless large, which had belonged to the Battiad princes." The disagreement seems to centre on whether Herodotus is referring to the secular

it seems quite clear that the Cyrenaean monarch was limited to the religious functions of the state and that Demonax was attempting to institute a constitutional monarchy.¹⁶ This part of Demonax' legislation must have been a compromise in response to democratic pressure, a compromise which in many other Greek states, e. g., at Argos, had been carried through by the citizens themselves, relegating their monarch to the supervision of religious matters. Apparently, then, the change Demonax made in the monarchy at Cyrene reflects the influence of a political institution with which he had personal experience.

Of course, we cannot be certain that the office held by Demonax at Mantinea was an elective one with limited tenure rather than an hereditary one with life-tenure. The former may be the more likely since Herodotus, Diodorus, and Athenaeus refer to him as merely a citizen; that is to say, he may have held the office for a limited time and then returned to the status of a private citizen. On the other hand, the certainty with which Heracleides twice calls him βασιλεὺς Μαντινέων may stand out a little more vigorously than the generic term ἀσπός or πολίτης and suggest that he held the office for life. But even so, we should hesitate to say that the office was hereditary since there is no evidence of a monarchy at Mantinea. For the same reason it seems more likely that the office was rather elective and of limited tenure.

Also, it seems reasonable to infer, as Fougères (*Mantinée*, p. 334) does, that the government of Mantinea in the sixth century was "une démocratie sagement établie" as reflected in the reputation of the city and in the activity of Demonax at

as well as the religious τέμενος; the secular is supported by Homeric usage, but the religious alone seems more reasonable from the context.

¹⁶ Cf. Hdt., IV, 162: Pheretima, the widow of Battus III, and her son, Arcesilaus III, reacted vigorously against Demonax' limitations on the royal powers (περὶ τῶν τιμῶν) and tried to recover their lost prerogatives (τὰ τῶν προγόνων γέρεα). Also, if G. Glotz, *The Greek City*, transl. by N. Mallinson (London, 1929), p. 42, is correct in considering the secular τέμενος did not form part of the royal patrimony, there is all the more reason for accepting the interpretation preferred in note 15 above. See also von Schoeffer in *R.-E.*, s. v. "Basileus," col. 58, who draws a sharp distinction between the king's τέμενος (zur Bestreitung der Ausgaben des Kultus . . . ein ausgewähltes Stück Land) and the ἀγρός (Privatgut). In any case, there can be no doubt of the direction Demonax' legislation took.

Cyrene,¹⁷ although the absence of further supporting evidence precludes any certainty on this point. If, however, it be true, we should have another detail reflecting the possible influence of Argos on Mantinea, for Argos ranks among the earliest strongholds of democracy in Greece. On the other hand it would be fallacious to argue—as Calderini Mondini (*loc. cit.*) has done, citing the above point made by Fougères—that either Hermippus himself or his epitomator, Heracleides Lembos, was mistaken in referring to Demonax as βασιλεὺς Μαντινέων because “il governo di Mantinea presenta fin dai tempi antichissimi di Demonatte il carattere di una democrazia rurale.”

Furthermore, in interpreting the advice given by the Delphic oracle to the people of Cyrene it is difficult to agree with Wade-Gery (in *C. A. H.*, III, p. 532) when he claims that “Delphi chose her [i. e., Mantinea] rather for her political innocence.” This seems to be a rather simplified view of an important political decision which Delphi had to make, in that the city finally chosen by the oracle could have determined to a great extent the nature of the reforms that would be made and also could have revealed a general preference by the oracle for certain reforms to which it practically lent its religious sanction in advance.¹⁸

However this may be, the interpretation offered here should, I believe, vindicate the authority of Heracleides Lembos in *P. Oxy.*, 1367, since it would not be refuted by Athenaeus or any of the previously known sources on Demonax. But what is more, with this interpretation our understanding of these previously known sources, especially Herodotus, can be considerably enhanced.

A. A. I. WAISGLASS.

¹⁷ It should be noted that all the evidence by Fougères, *Mantinee*, pp. 331 ff., to show Mantinea was a democracy from very early times is hardly cogent. All the evidence (drawn from Aristotle, Polybius, *et al.*) may just as well apply to the fifth century alone, when, by the more definite testimony of Thucydides, Mantinea was unquestionably a democracy.

¹⁸ An inscription from Elis records that two Mantineians had served as arbitrators at Skillus; this is dated by Blass (*G. D. I.*, no. 1151) prior to 570, when Skillus was destroyed. For other dates see Cauer-Schwyzler, *D. G. E.*, no. 418; but the date proposed by Blass seems to be the most acceptable. Thus there would be even more reason to consider the oracle's choice a shrewd one since Mantinea could have had some reputation in arbitrating settlements by Demonax' time (ca. 550 B. C.).

THE TWO BOAR-SACRIFICES IN THE IGUVINE TABLES.

The following passages in the Umbrian tablets of Iguvium call for the sacrifice of a victim the name of which is cognate with *L. aper* and is customarily rendered *aprum*, *apros* in the Latin translations:

I b 24 *Funtlere trif apruf rufu* = VII a 3-4 *Fondlire abrof trif fetu*
ute peiu feitu Cerfe Marti. *heriei rofu heriei peiu. Serfe Martie*
feitu popluper totar Iiounar tota-
per / Iiovina.

I b 33-4 *Pune purtingus kařetu* = VII a 42-3 *Ape / purdinřiust car-*
pufe apruf / fakurent puze erus situ pufe abrons facurent puse
teřa. *erus dera.*

II a 11 *Ahtu Marti abrunu perakne fetu.*

In VII a 43 Aufrecht and Kirchhoff emended to read *abrof*, Huschke to read *abrono*. In II a 11 Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, followed by Bréal, emended to read *abrum*. All subsequent editors maintain the original text in all the forms in question and all translate by *aprum* in II a 11 and by *apros* in the remaining passages. Devoto in his Italian translation¹ renders by *cinghiale* in II a 11, elsewhere by *cinghiali*. For a better understanding of the passages Buck's translation of VII a 3-4, 42-3 is given below:

3-4 *In Fontulis apros tris facito vel rufos vel piceos. Cerro Martio facito pro populo civitatis Iguvinae, pro civitate Iguvina.*

42-3 *Ubi porrexerit, vocato, quo loco apros fecerint, ut momentum det.*

I b 24 is so nearly identical with the first part of VII a 3-4, and I b 33-4 with VII a 42-3, as to make translation unnecessary. II a 11 will be discussed below.

The purpose of this article is to show that *aprunu* in II a 11 differs in sense from *apruf*, *abrof*, *abrons* in the other passages. It is clear that it represents a different stem-formation, as if a Latin *n*-stem **apro*, *-onis* existed beside *aper*, *apri*. All the instances in I b and VII a are clearly second-declension forms

¹ G. Devoto, *Le Tavole di Gubbio* (Florence, 1948).

with the possible exception of the anomalous acc. pl. *abrons* in VII a 43. This last form is commonly taken as nom. pl. *abron(e)s* used in place of the accusative, but its sense cannot be different from that of *apruf*, *abrof*, since *pufe abrons facurent* merely refers in an indirect manner to Fontuli, where the three boars were offered in VII a 3-4 = I b 24, and the victims in the first four passages are all unmistakably the same. With II a 11, however, the circumstances are altogether different. The sacrifice at Fontuli, to which the first four passages refer, was a part of the ceremonies of the lustration of the people, but II a 1-14 is devoted to a series of instructions for sacrifices to be offered in case of unfavorable auspices; the victim this time is a single one, not a triad, and the deity honored is the obscure Ahtus Martius, apparently a deification of the oracular utterance of Mars.² The most important difference between II a 11 and the other passages, however, is in certain details connected with the slaughter of the victim itself. VII a 4 (= I b 25) contains among other matters the instruction *uatuo ferine fetu*, the sense of which is uncertain, but which is elsewhere used only of oxen (I a 4, 13, 22, VI a 57, b 1, 19) or of bull-calves (I b 3, 5-6, VI b 43-4, 45).³ The sacrifices to Ahtus Jupiter and Ahtus Mars in II a 10-14 on the other hand contain an instruction *peṛae(m) fetu* which is known from several other passages in the Iguvine Tables but which is never found in the same sacrifices as *uatuo ferine fetu* and is never used in connection with victims of precisely the same type. It occurs in VI a 58 of pregnant sows, VI b 3 of sucking pigs, I b 28 = VII a 7 of sows, I b 32 = VII a 41 of heifer-calves, I b 44 = VII a 54 of heifers, and in III 32 of a sheep.⁴ II a 21-2 contains the sentence *esunu / peṛae futu* 'sacrificium humi stratum esto' used with reference to a dog.

² Cf. *Ahtu Iuvip(atre)* in line 10. *ahtu* is dat. sg. of **ah-tu-*, probably from **ag-tu-* with root of *L. aio*, *prod-ig-ium*, etc. Cf. Devoto, *Tabulae Iguvinae*, pp. 311, 314.

³ For an attempt at a new interpretation whereby *uatuo* is equivalent to *L. latera* with the sense 'ribs,' see Bottiglion, *Manuale dei dialetti italiani* (Bologna, 1954), p. 260, n. 5; also the present author, *A. J. P.*, LXXVI (1955), pp. 77-9.

⁴ I a 7-10 and 14-16, corresponding respectively to VI a 58-9 and b 3-5, lack the instruction *peṛae fetu* but contain *supa sumtu* in its place. A discussion of the relation between the two expressions is not necessary for the argument of this paper.

The etymological connection with *persi* 'pede, foot,' *perso* 'trench' (or 'mound'), *πέδον*, is almost certain, and Bücheler, p. 64, was doubtless correct in his belief that where the instruction *peṛae fetu* occurs the victim is to be slaughtered stretched on the ground, but the important point is the distribution of the two expressions *uatuo ferine fetu* and *peṛae(m) fetu* in relation to the types of victims, the former being used only of oxen and bull-calves, and of the three boars in the sacrifice at Fontuli, the latter predominantly, though not exclusively, of smaller victims. *peṛae fetu* occurs in the descriptions of all sacrifices *suilli generis* in the Iguvine Tables with the exception of the boar-sacrifice at Fontuli and the sacrifice of a pig and a goat in II b. It is very probable then that the *n*-stem *abrunu* in II a 11 is not a mere synonym of *apruf*, *abrof*, *abrons* in the description of the sacrifice at Fontuli, but designates a different victim sacrificed in a different manner, probably a young boar.

Unfortunately the support for *-ōn-* as a suffix used to make names for the young of animals is negligible. The Italic dialects are too poorly recorded to provide other examples. French *chaton* 'kitten' is too recent to give evidence of such a principle of word-formation in Latin.⁵ Leumann-Hofmann, p. 239, cite several correspondences of the type of *catus*: *Cato*, but they do not show the semantic variation for which we are searching; in fact the only animal names in the list are *capus*: *capo* 'capon,' which are mere synonyms. In Italian the suffix *-one* has an augmentative rather than a diminutive value. It appears, however, that the original function of the suffix *-ōn-* was to single out an individual as possessing a certain character, or certain associations, to an exceptional degree. The tone was often familiar, affectionate, or derogatory, and it was possible, under varying circumstances, for the formation to be specialized either with diminutive or augmentative value. The interpretation here proposed for *abrunu* as 'young boar' admittedly rests on very weak support on morphological grounds, but the arguments outlined above, based on difference of ritual, appear much stronger.

There remains the problem of *abrons* in VI a 43. There are no acc. pl. forms in *-s* in Umbrian; all end either in *-f* (<*-ns*)

⁵ Turning from Italic to Greek and from animal names to personal names we may cite the patronymic *Πηλείων* beside *Πηλεός* as an example of the use of *-ōn* to contrast the offspring with the parent.

or a vowel.⁶ *abrons* is therefore sometimes taken as nom. pl. from **aprones* erroneously written in place of the acc.⁷ Since there are no sure examples of the acc. pl. of masc. or fem. *n*-stems in Umbrian, we cannot be sure what the correct form would be, but it is better, if possible, not to assume an *n*-stem in VII a 43 at all, because of the close relationship of the passage to VII a 3-4, I b 24, 33-4, which have second-declension forms. Von Planta, I, pp. 510-11, favored the view that *abrons* is a unique example of a sandhi-doublet which could have continued to exist beside *abrof* under special conditions.⁸ In favor of this view it should be emphasized that in Oscan the acc. pl. of vowel-stems regularly ends in *-ss* or *-s*, never in *-f*, and similarly in Paelignian, though Marrucian has *iafc* with *f* before the enclitic *-c*. This distribution suggests that the change of final *-ns* to *-f* in the acc. pl. spread over Umbrian and Marrucian territory at a relatively recent date, after Oscan-Umbrian unity had been largely broken up. It would therefore not be surprising if an isolated Umbrian form should occur with the *-ns* preserved. It would be difficult to say precisely what phonetic environment favored this doublet. In the present instance the phonetic environment of *abrons* and *apruf* is identical in the earlier and later texts. But sometimes the later tables appear to show evidence of a much earlier archetype.⁹

JAMES W. POULTNEY.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

⁶ *struhqlas fiklas sufafias* II a 41 are taken by nearly all editors as gen. sg.

⁷ So Danielsson, *Altitalische Studien*, III, p. 146; Buck, § 181 b; Vetter, *Hdb. d. it. Dial.* (Heidelberg, 1953), p. 270; Pisani, *Le lingue dell' Italia antica oltre il latino* (Turin, 1953), p. 183, admits error as one possible explanation, the other being a phonetic development *-ōn-ns* > *-ōn-ens* > *-ōn-es* > *ons*, the second *n* having suffered dissimilatory loss too early for the change *-ns* > *-f* to take place.

⁸ The view of Bücheler, p. 112, is substantially the same. Devoto, p. 96, by implication, takes *abrons* as from the same stem with *abrof*, since he lists them among examples of the variation *ns/f*.

⁹ Cf. Devoto, *Tabulae Iguvinae*, p. 55.

GOODWIN OR GILDERSLEEVE?

A perusal of W. Kendrick Pritchett, "The Conditional Sentence in Attic Greek," *A. J. P.*, LXXVI (1955), pp. 1-17, leaves at least one reader partly but not wholly convinced. The problem with which Pritchett is primarily concerned is that of "the suitable grammatical nomenclature for the conditional sentence in Attic Greek—a nomenclature which will reflect ancient usage" (p. 15). It is with this problem that the present paper is concerned.

Pritchett argues that Gildersleeve's terminology is preferable to that employed by Goodwin and used generally in the United States. The classifications are as follows, arranged according to Pritchett (p. 5), except that the order under Goodwin has been changed so that the same Roman numerals shall apply to the same constructions.

GILDERSLEEVE

- I Logical
- II Anticipatory or legal
- III Ideal
- IV Unreal

GOODWIN

- I Present or past conditions with nothing implied
- II Future conditions, more vivid form
- III Future conditions, less vivid form
- IV Present and past conditions with supposition contrary to fact

I

According to Pritchett (p. 6), "all that the logical condition asserts is the inexorable connection of the two members of the sentence."

There are two arguments against the choice of "logical" to designate conditions of Type I. In the first place, this type is no more logical than Type IV. Cf. (I) "If the weather is favorable, an atom bomb test is being held in Bikini today," and (IV) "If the weather had been favorable, an atom bomb test

would have been held yesterday." Pritchett himself states (p. 8) that these two types of condition are akin.

In the second place, instances occur of "present and past conditions with nothing implied," to which the term "logical" is inapplicable. There is no place for such conditions in Gildersleeve's scheme. Cf. Eurip., *I. T.*, 1288:

τί δ' ἔστιν, εἰ χρὴ μὴ κελευσθεῖσαν λέγειν;

There is no "inexorable connection" between the condition and the asking of the question. Cf. also Eurip., *El.*, 1086-7:

εἰ δ' ὥς λέγεις σὴν θυγατέρ' ἔκτεινεν πατήρ,
ἐγὼ τί σ' ἠδίκησ' ἐμός τε σύγγονος;¹

For the condition of Type I Goodwin's terminology seems to me superior to Gildersleeve's.

II-III

In Attic Greek there are two principal kinds of future conditions. In one *ἐάν* (or *ἥν*) with the subjunctive normally occurs in the protasis, the future indicative in the apodosis. In the other kind *εἰ* with the optative occurs in the protasis, the optative with *ἄν* in the apodosis. Goodwin thinks that the difference between the two types is one of vividness. Pritchett, on the other hand, contends (p. 4) that "the optative form of the condition is as 'vivid' as . . . the subjunctive, but the 'vividness' is the 'vividness' not of prophecy nor of calculation, but of fancy."

This contention is supported by the following passage:

Homer, *Il.*, XII, 322-8:

ᾧ πέπον, εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φυγόντε
αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγῆρω τ' ἀθανάτω τε
ἔσσεσθ', οὔτε κεν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μαχοίμην
οὔτε κε σὲ στέλλοιμι μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν·
νῦν δ' ἔμπηξ γὰρ κῆρες ἐφ' ἐστᾶσιν θανάτοιο
μυρίαί, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι,
ἴομεν, ἥε τῷ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν, ἥε τις ἡμῖν.

For Attic Greek compare, though the parallel is not exact:

¹ All of my illustrations are taken from Euripides, most of whose plays I have skimmed for the purposes of this study.

Eurip., *Herc. Fur.*, 1114-15:

Her. πρᾶσσω δ' ἐγὼ τί λυπρόν, οὐ δακρυρροεῖς;
Am. ἂ καὶν θεῶν τις, εἰ πάθοι, καταστένοι.

Pritchett refers to the lines from Homer (p. 4, n. 13) and comments: "Here the hypothetical ideal condition requires the optative. This ideal condition is then opposed to νῦν δέ (line 326), which is frequently used in the sequel of the unreal, less often after the ideal conditional. I have encountered no example of it after the anticipatory form."

The passage from Homer is an argument in favor of Gildersleeve—Pritchett. There is no objective evidence, so far as I know, in favor of Goodwin's "more or less vividness." For that matter, it is hard to see how, even if Goodwin were right, there could be objective evidence for his theory. The present writer agrees with Gildersleeve and Pritchett, principally because her *Sprachgefühl* agrees with theirs.²

Yet is the name "ideal" entirely satisfactory?

It has the advantage of harmonizing with the terminology of German scholars, for example of J. M. Stahl in *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Heidelberg, 1907), p. 269, 3. Yet in English it has a connotation which might easily mislead the young student; for "ideal" includes the meanings of the two German terms, *ideell* and *ideal*. Might not a better English word be found to indicate how this optative feels? Would not "imaginative" be preferable to "ideal"?

² At one point Pritchett has overstated his case. After quoting three passages in which an ideal condition is followed by a wish that the condition may not be fulfilled, he comments (p. 5):

"In no one of these examples do I believe that the use of the optative involves 'less vividness.' Nor would the *ἐάν conditional* be a suitable substitute. The condition of the optative, as the ideal condition, conjures up images of desire and dread, and the optative form is thus the favorite whenever there is a wish for or against, as in the above examples" (italics mine).

But compare the two following passages, the former of which is one of Pritchett's examples:

Eurip., fr. 529 N: εἰ δ' εἰς γάμους ἔλθοιμ' ὃ μὴ τύχοι ποτέ, | τῶν ἐν δόμοισιν ἡμερενουσῶν ἀεὶ | βελτίον' ἂν τέκοιμι δώμασιν τέκνα. Eurip., *Phoen.*, 571-2: φέρ', ἣν ἔλθς γῆν τήνδ', ὃ μὴ τύχοι ποτέ, | πρὸς θεῶν, τρόπαια πῶς ἀναστήσεις Διί;

Goodwin's "more vivid future condition" (II) is named "anticipatory" or "legal" by Gildersleeve. "Anticipatory" is open to the objection that the term applies equally well to III, which like II refers to future time.³ Is Gildersleeve's alternative name, "legal," better? As Pritchett points out (p. 7), Type II is the prevalent form of condition in legal documents. However, it is used also in contexts which have nothing of the rigor of law. Cf. Eurip., *I. A.*, 1271-2:

ἀλλ' Ἑλλάς, ἧ δεῖ, καὶ θέλω καὶ μὴ θέλω,
θῶσαί σε.

If we call Type III "imaginative," might we not designate II as "matter of fact?" We should then say, "Future condition, matter of fact type," and "Future condition, imaginative type."

IV

For the fourth type of condition, Gildersleeve's term has the advantage of agreement with European usage (cf., e. g., Stahl, *op. cit.*, p. 281, 2; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, II: *Syntaxe* [Paris, 1953], § 415). Further, "unreal" is more brief than "contrary to fact." Yet it seems to me that the greater perspicuity of the term "contrary to fact" outweighs those advantages.

The terminology which the present writer would favor for the four main types of conditions in classical Greek would be as follows:

- I Present and past conditions with nothing implied
- II Future conditions, matter of fact type
- III Future conditions, imaginative type
- IV Conditions contrary to fact

ALICE F. BRAUNLICH.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

³ As Pritchett states, p. 6, n. 19, "anticipation is not synonymous with expectation, nor is there any element of probability."

REVIEWS.

GILBERT BAGNANI. *Arbiter of Elegance, A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1954. Pp. xi + 91. \$2.75. (*The Phoenix, Supplementary Volume II.*)

Here is a book that is a delight to read. Professor Bagnani has managed to combine scholarship with common sense, learning with imagination, and the pedestrian fact with the flash of illuminating wit. What is more, he has achieved this rare feat with apparent ease and conspicuous good taste. The scholar who has read widely in the vast field of literature that has accumulated around the *Satyricon* will find that there is still something fresh to be said about this unique masterpiece of the ancient world, whether or not he agrees with some of the conclusions. The novice will soon realize that he is in the hands of an expert guide. Both will be grateful not only for what the author has to say but for his way of saying it. For the book has style.

"The present state of the 'Petronius Question' can only be described as unsatisfactory." These are the words with which the author begins his first chapter, "The Date and Authorship of the *Satyricon*" (pp. 3-26). This, to put it mildly, is an understatement. Since E. V. Marmorale published his book *La Questione Petroniana* in 1948 in which he argues for a date of composition in the reign of Commodus or later, scholars have been compelled to review the evidence and to reaffirm their points of view. Maiuri with his incomparable knowledge of Campanian antiquities was not slow to spring to the defense of the more traditional attribution of the *Satyricon* to the time of Nero (*Parola del Passato*, 1948, pp. 101 ff.). His review-article should be read in conjunction with the admirable introduction to his edition of the *Cena* (Napoli, 1945). Most of the other reviewers were equally unconvinced by Marmorale's arguments. But several perceived with Whatmough (*C. P.*, XLIV [1949], p. 247), whom Bagnani cites, that the evidence in its present state leads to assumptions that are not capable of proof, attractive or reasonable as they may be.

Bagnani is fully aware of this fact and illustrates it by giving examples of the way in which one short passage of the text (58, 10) has been interpreted by several scholars as reflecting quite different periods of time. His own position is this: since there is no direct evidence that connects the Petronius who was the author of the *Satyricon* with the Petronius of Tacitus (*Ann.*, XVI, 17-19), the dating of the work itself is the only way by which its author can be identified; furthermore, if it can be proved that the work was written between 55 and 66 A. D., there can be no reasonable doubt that the work was written by the Petronius of Tacitus.

Few scholars, I believe, would quarrel with this reasoning. Although the composition of the *Satyricon* has usually been assigned to the time of Nero because of the assumption that it was written

by the Petronius of Tacitus, the very reasons that led to this assumption become conclusive, if it can be shown that the work was composed while Petronius was mature and alive. These reasons are familiar to every student of the *Satyricon* and have been neatly summarized by Paratore (*Il Satyricon di Petronio*, I, pp. 3f.). They need not be repeated here.

Bagnani gradually reduces the period of time during which the *Satyricon* might have been written. Since a passage in the text (57, 4) could hardly have been written after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, he arrives at 212 A.D. as a *terminus ante quem*. His *terminus post quem* is furnished by the parody of Lucan (119 ff.). Bagnani believes that the author of the *Satyricon* may have known that Lucan was writing his epic as early as 58 A.D. Consequently, we have a first period extending from 58 to 212 A.D.

A shrewd observation on an aspect of the *mores* portrayed in the *Satyricon* next allows Bagnani to assume that it was composed before the reign of Hadrian. The rank irreligiosity which is manifest in so many parts of the work—which, in fact, pervades it,—“is hardly conceivable at any period after the accession of Hadrian, when even scepticism, as in Lucian, becomes militant and doctrinaire” (p. 12). The point is well made. In the *Satyricon* we are indeed far removed from the religious climate of the Hadrianic age (most recently outlined by W. den Boer, *Mnemosyne*, VIII [1955], pp. 123 ff.) and Apuleius’ story of redemption and regeneration. Moreover, Paratore (*op. cit.*, p. 22) points out something which Bagnani might well have mentioned in this connection: the lack in the *Satyricon* of the autobiographical element which is conspicuous in many literary works of the second century of the Empire militates against the likelihood that it was written at that time. But even if we move the *terminus ante quem* down to the accession of Hadrian, we are left with some sixty years.

Bagnani narrows down this period considerably by calling attention to certain implications in some remarks of Echion in the *Cena* (45, 7-8). They concern the fate which awaits the steward of a certain Glyco. The miserable fellow was caught in a compromising situation with his mistress, Glyco’s wife, and Glyco condemned him to be pitted against wild beasts in the arena (*dispensatorem ad bestias dedit*). Echion is indignant. Glyco is a no-account and his wife’s promiscuity is notorious. *Quid servus peccavit qui coactus est facere?* An indelible stigma will be attached to Glyco—yes, Glyco.

Now it is perfectly clear, as Bagnani points out, that Glyco acted *suo arbitrio* in handing over his steward-slave *ad bestias*. But this procedure was expressly forbidden by a *lex Petronia* and *Senatus consulta* pertaining thereto. The law is cited by Modestinus in the *Digest* (XLVIII, 8, 11): *Servo sine iudice ad bestias dato, non solum qui vendidit poena, verum et qui comparavit, tenebitur. Post legem Petroniam et senatus consulta ad eam legem pertinentia, dominis potestas ablata est ad bestias depugnandas suo arbitrio servos tradere: oblato tamen iudici servo, si iusta sit domini querella, sic poenae tradetur*. Consequently, either Glyco violated the law or the law had not yet been passed when the chapter was written. Bagnani states (p. 16) that “the whole point of the story would be missed if its readers were used to the conditions created

by that statute" (the *lex Petronia*). I should add that in view of Echion's indignation and the fact that the town was divided into two camps over the affair, the *zelotypi* and the *amasiunculi*, it is not credible that Echion would not have mentioned that Glyco was acting illegally, if that had been the case.

So far, so good. But, unfortunately we do not know when the *lex Petronia* was passed. Bagnani is right, I believe, in holding that it was not connected with the *lex Junia Petronia* of 19 A.D. (Westermann should be added to the list of those who identify the two laws; *R.-E.*, Suppl. VI, col. 1042) or with the other *leges Petroniae* known to us. It is reasonably certain that the law was in force at the time when Aulus Gellius wrote up the story of Androcles and the Lion (V, 14) which he had found in Apion. For the sentence (*dominus*) *me statim rei capitalis damnandum dandumque ad bestias curavit* (27) very probably reflects the legal phraseology of the law (so also Westermann, *ibid.*). But the notice in Gellius leaves us in the second part of the second century.

To date this law more precisely, only one way is left and that is to attempt to establish its place in the current of "humane" legislation designed to restrict the absolute right of masters over the persons of their slaves. This approach is followed by Bagnani. He begins his survey with the well-known enactments of Claudius (Suet., *Claud.*, 25; *Digest*, XL, 8, 2) that sick slaves who had been cast out to die by their masters would not come into their possession again if they recovered; furthermore, that if a master preferred killing his slave to casting him out, he could be charged with murder.

Bagnani notices that there was a way by which the obvious intent of his legislation could be circumvented. If a master was restrained from putting an unwanted slave to death or from casting him out without the risk of losing him for good, he still might get rid of him by condemning him *ad bestias suo arbitrio*. The *lex Petronia* closed this gap effectively. Such flaws in legislation are usually discovered through experience within a reasonably short period of time and we can assume that the *lex Petronia*, if it served as a remedial measure, was passed not too long after the original enactments which it was designed to strengthen.

Yet, I am inclined to think that there is more in the passage of Modestinus than Bagnani apparently perceived. The jurist mentions a *lex Petronia* and *senatus consulta ad eam legem pertinentia*. It would appear, then, that an original law was reinforced by several subsequent *senatus consulta*. D'Orgeval (*L'Empereur Hadrien*, p. 67) suggests that the original law forbade a master to sell his slave to be thrown to the beasts. To circumvent this law, a master could sell his unwelcome slave to a *lanista* "*ad bestias depugnandas*." Hadrian would then have put a stop to this through the aforementioned *senatus consulta*.

D'Orgeval seems to be on the right track, but his hypothesis lends itself to a reasonable modification. Let us note that Modestinus states that both buyer and seller of a slave destined *ad bestias* are subject to punishment. We find an interesting parallel to this provision in an edict of Hadrian on castration preserved by Ulpian (*Digest*, XLVIII, 8, 4). Castration of a free man or slave, with or without consent, is absolutely forbidden. Moreover, not only is the person who consented to castration subject to capital punish-

ment, but the doctor also who performed the emasculation. In this way Hadrian extended the guilt to both parties and put additional teeth in the legislation against castration which had begun with Domitian (Suet., *Domit.*, 7; cf. *Digest*, XLVIII, 8, 6). Let us also note that Hadrian forbade the selling of slaves to *lenones* and *lanistae* without due cause (*S. H. A., Hadr.*, 18, 8).

In view of the letter and spirit of this legislation of Hadrian, it may be reasonable to assume that the provision making both the buyer and seller of a slave guilty for violation of the *lex Petronia* was contained in a *senatus consultum* of the time of Hadrian. The original law, then, would have done no more than annul the power of masters to hand over (*tradere*) their slaves, presumably to the givers of games, *ad bestias depugnandas suo arbitrio*. There would have been no question of sale; only of getting rid of an unwanted slave in an abominable manner. But the *lex Petronia* which forbade this to be done *sine iudice*, could be circumvented as d'Orgeval perceived, by a legitimate sale of a slave to a giver of games who would run the risk of forcing a slave into the arena without the authority of a magistrate. This second master would, of course, be guilty of violating the *lex Petronia*. But under the later legislation his guilt would be shared with the original owner and the latter would be deterred from conniving to get rid of a slave in this way. Again Hadrian would have been strengthening an earlier law for the protection of a slave's person.

Finally, Bagnani points out that we have no evidence for comitial legislation under the Flavians and that its revival under Nerva is doubtful. This strengthens the probability that the *lex Petronia*, if it was a *lex rogata*, falls within the reign of Nero. Moreover, we know of only one Petronius who was consul between the end of Nero's reign and the reign of Pius: M. Petronius Umbrinus, suffect in 81.

During the reign of Nero four Petronii were consuls. The *lex Petronia* in which we are interested is usually attributed to P. Petronius Turpilianus who was consul in 61. He was the author of another *lex rogata*, the *lex Petronia de adulterii indicio*. On the other hand Bagnani (p. 22) calls attention to an historical incident which might have created an atmosphere favorable to the drafting and passage of our law. It occurred in 61, when the urban prefect, Pedanius Secundus, was murdered by one of his slaves and the entire *familia*, four hundred in number, were condemned to death (Tacitus, *Ann.*, XIV, 42-5). The indignation of the common people at the execution of so many innocent human beings caused serious disorders and the sentiments of the senators themselves were divided. Nevertheless, the mass execution was decreed on the motion of Cassius and carried out with the help of soldiers who were ordered out to restrain the threatening populace. After an act of such ruthlessness, there is often a tendency to make amends in some way or other, and there can be no doubt that any law designed to give the person of slaves some additional protection would have been passed enthusiastically at the time.

If our *lex Petronia* was passed after 61, T. Petronius Niger and Petronius Arbiter alone remain as candidates for its authorship. In view of the Arbiter's friendship with Nero, Bagnani suggests either 60 or 61 as a plausible date for his consulship. This was a

period when Seneca was falling out of favor and the influence of Tigellinus was not yet overwhelming. Also the Arbiter would have been an excellent choice to preside over the celebration of the *Neronia* as consul. But here we are on very uncertain ground both as to the date of the Arbiter's consulship and the author of the *lex Petronia*. Bagnani is well aware of this, for he writes (p. 24) "I hope I have proved without reference to the *Satiricon* that the *lex Petronia de servis* was enacted under Nero, probably by Petronius Turpilianus in A. D. 61, possibly by Petronius Arbiter or by T. Petronius Niger between A. D. 60 and the end of the reign."

I have devoted by far the greater part of this review to this first chapter of Bagnani's book because it seemed to me that it contains the most cogent reasoning and persuasive conclusions in regard to a very important point of literary history: the date of the *Satyricon*. Of all indications of date within the work itself, Bagnani has put his finger on the strongest and has worked out its implications in a masterly fashion. There will be some, of course, who will not be convinced. But any future discussion of the subject will have to begin with acceptance or refutation of Bagnani's arguments; and in my opinion, these arguments will not be easily refuted.

The second chapter is entitled "The Date, Purpose and Authorship of the *Ludus De Morte Claudii*" (pp. 27-46). With regard to the date, Bagnani argues that a political pamphlet such as the *Ludus* must by its very purpose and nature be immediately topical; consequently the *Ludus* itself must have been written and circulated very soon after the death of Claudius in October, 54. In assuming this date, he agrees with Momigliano (*C. Q.*, XXXVIII [1944], pp. 96 ff.) against Miss Toynbee (*C. Q.*, XXXVI [1942], pp. 83 ff.) who would connect the composition of the *Ludus* with the celebration of the *Neronia* in 60.

Is it likely then, he asks, that Seneca to whom the work is attributed in our manuscripts should have written it at that time? A review of the philosopher's political position at the beginning of Nero's reign leads to a strongly negative answer. The same answer had already been made by Miss Toynbee (*op. cit.*). But what shall we do then with the express testimony of Dio (LX, 35) that Seneca wrote an *Apocolocyntosis* which has generally been identified with the *Ludus*? Surely this piece of concrete information should outweigh such general considerations as make it unlikely that Seneca was the author.

Bagnani returns to the position of Adolf Stahr (*Agrippina, die Mutter Nero's* [1867], pp. 330 ff.; the second edition of 1880 to which Bagnani refers was not at my disposal) and refuses to accept identification of the two works. He will have nothing to do with the laborious and devious methods by which many scholars in many different ways have attempted to make the title "Pumpkinification" applicable to the *Ludus*. Examining the passage in which Dio mentions the *Apocolocyntosis* (LX, 35), he suggests that the work was concerned in some measure with the poisoning of Claudius and "also explained or described how Claudius had got himself 'pumpkinified'" (p. 34). In this conjecture he follows Stahr (*op. cit.*). But it is his own thought that the *Apocolocyntosis* might have been written after the murder of Agrippina as part of a campaign of vilification which was directed against her in order to give strength to the official story

that she had attempted to do away with her son. After all, what could be expected of a woman who had wantonly poisoned her husband?

The sordid role played by Seneca in drafting an official explanation of Agrippina's death that also blackened her character is well attested by Tacitus (*Ann.*, XIV, 10-11) and Quintilian (VIII, 5, 18). According to Tacitus, who summarizes it, the poisoning of Claudius by Agrippina was not mentioned. This is readily understandable, since it was to this criminal act that Nero owed his accession to the throne. Is it likely, then, that Seneca at this time would have published a pamphlet which would indeed have put Agrippina in a darker light, but at the same time could not have helped being very damaging to Nero and himself? For given Nero's monstrous character, most recently exemplified in the murder of his mother, and Seneca's attempt to conceal his crime, who would not have been inclined to believe that Nero had been privy to the poisoning of Claudius and that Seneca had shown complaisance, at least, in regard to the deed, if he had not actually participated in it?

Moreover, what of the title *Apocolocyntosis*? In denying Senecan authorship to the *Ludus*, Bagnani finds it "quite impossible to believe that Seneca would ever do anything 'just for fun'" (p. 41). But can this title be anything but humorous or witty? And would it be appropriate for a serious attack on Agrippina's murder of her husband? I agree that it is unlikely that Seneca was the author of the *Ludus* for the chronological and political reasons set forth by Bagnani; and on the authority of Dio, I believe that Seneca wrote an *Apocolocyntosis*, the contents of which are unknown to us. But if we must conjecture about them, I should prefer the approach of Stahr (*op. cit.*, pp. 342 ff.) who would connect the title with the purgative quality of the *cucurbita* (Celsus, II, 29) and Claudius' stomach disorders. A salutary evacuation is part of one version of Claudius' death (Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 67); and to combat the story of poisoning, a version that Claudius had died of an overdose of a purge which his gluttony had caused him to take and which in turn led to his deification—god through pumpkin—would have been an amusing antidote to the grim stories which were circulating; an attempt, in other words, to laugh them out of court. Such a work could have been written at any time after the deification of Claudius when the rumors that he had been poisoned had gained strength and needed to be combatted.

Finally, given the similarity in language between the *Ludus* and the *Satyricon*, Bagnani suggests very tentatively that Petronius may also have been the author of the former work. From the *Ludus* he disengages the kind of mentality that would have produced it which accords with his concept of Petronius, author of the *Satyricon*. Here we are on very subjective grounds, except for the undeniable linguistic parallels which can be explained by imitation as well as by common authorship. If I may also express a subjective opinion in this regard, I do not feel it to be likely that the literary genius who composed the *Satyricon* was also the author of the rather dull and labored *Ludus*, regardless of age at time of writing.

The third chapter, "Gay Petronius" (the phrase is Pope's), is a remarkable mixture of good scholarship and sensitive imagination. In the first part (pp. 47-56) Bagnani reconstructs the stemma of

that part of the *gens Petronia* to which the Arbiter belonged. In the second (pp. 56-69), he offers us a biography of the man. In doing so, he assumes of course that the author of the *Satyricon* and the *Ludus* was the Arbiter of Tacitus. The background is known from the historians and so are the other characters on the stage. Some like Seneca and Lucan also speak to us through their own works. Bagnani has created a Petronius who is made up of the facts and characteristics attested by Tacitus and what he considers to be reflections in the *Satyricon* and *Ludus* of the mind and personality of their author.

This Petronius is then made to wend his way through the historical events of the period, reacting to them and the men and women whom he encounters "in character." There is not a grain of evidence for many of the events,—for example, a friendship with Messalina. But the psychological insight which assumes that Petronius would have detested Seneca, philosophers, and "the High Seriousness" hits the mark squarely in the middle. I shall not do Bagnani the injustice of summarizing or paraphrasing his brilliant description. It must be read to be appreciated. Forse, non é tutto vero; ma é molto ben trovato.

Six short excurses and an *index locorum* (pp. 76-91) conclude the book. Most of them expand views already expressed in the text. Here I cannot refrain from quoting one sentence from the excursus on vulgar Latin (p. 73): "Petronius and the society for which he is writing will have considered all the characters, Encolpius and Agamemnon included, as appallingly vulgar." What fountains of ink and reams of paper spent on Petronius' latinity would have been conserved, if the simple truth of this statement had been realized.

HENRY T. ROWELL.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

J. MARTIN, ed. T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex. 2nd ed. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1953. Pp. xxiv + 285. DM. 9.60.

The text of Martin's second edition of Lucretius—a conservative text—does not differ much from that of his first edition of 1934, save for several new transpositions. The *apparatus*, on the other hand, is markedly different, having been thoroughly revised and usefully expanded.

O and *Q*, together with the *schedae G, U, and V*, still remain the chief textual supports. As for the *Itali*, though Martin, doubtless under the influence of Diels, had himself done much careful work on these MSS—he cites in his *apparatus* only those Italian readings which he deems of particular importance—yet neither in 1934 nor in 1953 did he subscribe to Diels' theory that Poggio's exemplar was copied from *O* (with complicated influences from *Q*). To Martin as to most students, Lachmann's view that Poggio's MS came from the archetype from which *O* and *Q* were derived still seems correct. Hence Martin reasonably argues that these *Itali* deserve thoughtful

attention, even though we may often be unable to distinguish inherited readings from astute emendations.

As every student of Lucretius' text knows, such is the nature of our MSS that many emendations (or lifeless daggers) are inevitable. True, the corruptions are not so numerous as nineteenth-century editors imagined. Lucretian, not Virgilian, standards have now been applied to Lucretius! But a host of corruptions remains, and these are much more glaring than in the case of authors like Horace or Virgil who were regularly read and commented upon in the late Empire and in the Middle Ages. To emend the text of Lucretius with even tolerable success, mere competence in palaeography and a theory about a *stemma codicum* are not enough. We must thoroughly know the whole Lucretian text itself—Martin makes good use of this knowledge in his own conjectures—and then know Lucretian syntax, accidence, vocabulary, and prosody, and then Epicurean philosophy (though not to enslave Lucretius to Epicurean remains), and finally we must work to understand the Lucretian mind along the lines that Büchner and Bailey have pointed out. Then, too, we must consult the poets who echo Lucretius, and not forget, either, the *De Natura Deorum*. But when most of all this, or even a decent part of it, has been mastered, to select an emendation out of the multitude proposed, or to prefer one of your own devising, is a hard task.

I have noted thirty-five emendations of his own which Martin has admitted to his text. Since these will interest Lucretian students, I list them: I, 555, 657; II, 43, 209, 422, 428, 462, 467, 547, 911, 926, 928; III, 240, 594, 935, 962; IV, 471, 491, 545, 632, 1168; V, 429 (oddly enough, in the second edition assigned neither to Martin nor any other source, and no note of *conventa OQ*), 485, 568, 1339, 1442; VI, 83, 131, 490, 541, 550, 555, 858, 972, 1012. It is difficult to pass judgment on these. Perhaps Gildersleeve was wiser when, in a lordly modesty, he said of his Pindar: "The text of this edition . . . has been constituted according to my best judgment, and that best judgment has excluded all emendations of my own." Martin has given up four of his own which he had inserted in his 1934 edition (III, 58; IV, 544, 822; V, 1094), and has added two new ones (I, 657; IV, 471). To comment on a few, the support Martin thinks to derive from IV, 510 for *quae sint* in I, 657 is outweighed by the palaeographical difficulty of extracting that phrase from the MSS' *musē* or *mu* or *mussant* or else by the difficulty of explaining how this *mu*-pattern ambled into this meadow. If I were not to take Bignone's *Musae* (which I like), I should then read *L*²'s *inesse* (which I suspect to be an ingenious conjecture). In IV, 471 *minuam*, I agree, is as palaeographically acceptable as *mittam* for the *mituam* of *OQ*—to explain the "u" in terms of either majuscule or minuscule script is equally hard—but I am not sure that II, 1029 is parallel (since I do not know whether *mirarier* of the *Itali* is there an object of *minuant* or actually a prolate infinitive). On the other hand, in support of *mittam*, cf. IV, 690 and VI, 1056. His *videre* in IV, 491 (*videri* Ω *seorsum Bentl.*) seems to me excellent, supported both by palaeographical likelihood and by cross-references. But to read in IV, 1168, in the list of endearing names to cover your love's defects, *nimia* for the hallowed *tumida* (at *nimia et mammosa Ceres*) is rather a shock. All the MSS read *iamina*, and so Martin's conjecture is perhaps palaeo-

graphically better. Still, we might imagine a confusion between "I" and "T" in rustic capitals and one between "u" and open "a" in minuscules. But I cannot, I admit, account for a confusion between "n" and "d." Nonetheless, *nimia* is certainly less spirited (in a spirited passage), and Ovid, *A. A.*, II, 661 wrote *turgida* in imitation. Finally, in the defective line VI, 83, Martin proposes *est ratio caeli <que igni> sive tenenda*. Apart from the fact that this suggestion of *ignis* narrows the subject too much, I find the rhythm displeasing, and from both points of view I prefer Bailey's *est ratio <terrae> caelique tenenda*.

As for transpositions, only three disturb me—a remarkably low number when one thinks of the almost infinite possibilities! It is surprising, and a bit disheartening, to find that Martin puts lines 50-61 of the first proem after line 135. Surprising, because he had resisted any such temptation in 1934; disheartening, because I had thought that we had moved away, in Lucretian criticism, from such subjective license. For in the end such an arbitrary transposition indicates that an editor believes that he (and usually he alone) actually knows what an ancient poet first wrote, what changes he subsequently made, and what changes he would have made (had he lived longer or been a better poet). Martin refers to his "Lukrez und Cicero," *Würzburger Jahrb.*, IV (1949/50), pp. 1-52 and 309-29. This is a study of much value and sense, but its proposals do not justify moving the text about. This sort of thing should be kept to the *apparatus*. In the fourth proem, however, where plainly something must be done, Martin puts lines 45-51 after line 25, and lines 52-3 after line 30. Though again I should prefer to print the text as the MSS give it and use brackets, I have much sympathy with Martin's procedure. For here we *see* two strata; we do not divine them by intuition. I disapprove, however, of putting VI, 92-5, the invocation to Calliope, after line 47. I am not so much moved by the fact that these lines dwell so insecurely in their new abode that they have to be protected front and rear by asterisks, as I am by more general considerations. Lucretius' habit is to open a book with praise, a brief résumé, and a syllabus of what is to come. In the last book, which is the last lap, an invocation to parallel in a sense the one to Venus is called for. But it should come after the usual sequence of praise-résumé-syllabus. Lines 1-42 eulogize Epicurus, 43-6 look back to the first half of Book V, line 47 is a *crux* but probably refers to his poetic mission (and perhaps its final course; hence Martin's shift), 48-50 begins the syllabus of Book VI and lead the poet, as he has so often been led, to take up digressively one of his chief purposes in writing the work: to free men from fear—this time, fear of the gods. So then lines 51-67 take up the false idea of the gods, and lines 68-79 are inevitable: the true (i. e. the Epicurean) idea of the gods. Lines 80-82 are transitional, and 83-9 again pick up the syllabus. Now is the time for the invocation.

To come to the final transposition, after line 1286, with which the MSS end the work, Martin puts lines 1247-51. This is a shift (in 1934 assigned to himself, and now rightly to Bockemüller) *quo melius concluditur opus et ordo servatur Thucydidis*. Beneath the *melius* we again detect the quietly patronizing attitude of being ready to help out the poet when he nods, though the transposers would indignantly protest that they were only righting the wrongs

that Time had wrought. Since I myself believe that Lucretius deliberately intended to end his poem with the terrifying picture of mankind in the plague, in order to frighten men into salvation, i.e. Epicureanism, I should consider the abrupt starkness of line 1286 to be just what the poet sought. "But now," you will ask, "who is becoming subjective?" As for the *ordo Thucydidis*, it is a bit broken in Martin's quotation by the omission of ἄλλου (and the reference should be "2, 52, 4"). The other transpositions that I have noticed are the conventional ones. All in all, as I said, I consider him conservative on this score.

In bracketing, too, Martin seems conservative. He no longer prints II, 42^a (cited by Nonius), and I agree that this line probably should not be put into our texts at all. And he now brackets V, 312—an improvement over his 1934 edition. For what is the force of *proporro* here, and what sort of construction is *quaerere senescere*?

To pass to the *testimonia*, the collection of these is one of the best features of the edition, and a truly remarkable inclusion in a medium-sized single volume. We all doubtless wish that Bailey had added such a collection to his 1947 edition. Further, Martin often gives readings from the *testimonia* in the apparatus, so that they are actually used in establishing the text. And such a collection is indispensable for a study of Lucretian *Fortleben*. Martin began, of course, with Diels' rich gathering, but did a good deal of garnering for himself. I have noticed no changes—there may well be some—between the 1934 and the 1953 collections.

The *apparatus* is a model of economy. Because Martin himself does not explain how it works, and because I think it worthy of imitation in editions of authors with only a few MSS (or perhaps even for texts whose MSS can be fairly definitely classified into families), I should like briefly to give its *ratio*.

Its basis is the elimination or "positive-negative" system. The reader can assume that all of the MSS (save for the *Itali*) are always taken into account. Hence by the subtraction of MSS giving the "wrong" readings noted in the *apparatus*, the reader knows what MSS give the "right" reading. No *lemmata* need fill up the *apparatus*, unless the source of the "right" reading is no one of these basic MSS but is a *testimonium* or a conjecture. Rarely a *lemma* is needed for variants which in themselves would give no hint of what they are variants of, as in I, 104: *iam] me QG* (by elimination, you know that *O* gives *iam*). For contrast, look at Bailey's O. C. T. edition where, as with most editions, the reader must rely upon the judiciousness of the economy-driven editor's selection, with no hope for completeness (I disregard minor orthographical variants). But Martin's system involves more than just elimination. Diels had used *O* for the uncorrected *Oblongus*, *O** for the *Oblongus* not yet corrected, and *O*¹ for contemporary correctors (and *O*^s for the Anglo-Saxon corrector, and *O*² for recent correctors). But he did not fully carry through an elimination system. Martin, however, uses *O* for the uncorrected *Oblongus*, *O*¹ for the *Oblongus* not yet corrected, and *O*² for all correctors (except the Anglo-Saxon, which is designated *O*^s as with Diels). The advantage of using Martin's *O*¹ symbol (which he applies to all his MSS) is that, by the process of elimination, it immediately makes you reckon with an *O*² (which is most often unrecorded in the *apparatus*). For example,

on I, 77 Bailey notes: *quam O¹ quantum OQ*. But Martin need only write *quantum O¹QGJ*. Martin's *O¹*—not to be confused with Bailey's *O¹* which is the conventional symbol we are all used to for the contemporary or first corrector—immediately tells you by elimination that *O* was corrected into reading what is the source (viz. *O²*) of the text (along with the two other MSS Bailey omits, *G* and *J*). Or take I, 100. Bailey gives: *classi QGO¹ classis O*. Martin gives only: *classis O¹*. The *O¹* tells you first that *O²* corrected it "correctly"—had it been "incorrectly," the "incorrect" correction would be noted—and second that by elimination you can assume that the other MSS in the picture at this point also give the accepted reading.

We all are familiar with the elimination system. But the idea of using a symbol for the *uncorrected* MS and its utility in the elimination system is not so common at all. In these days of increasing costs of printing, here perhaps is an admirable way of reducing the size but not the contents of an *apparatus*.

I notice that when Martin cites a *testimonium* as a source for a correct reading in which *O²* also shares, he cites *O²* also, probably for clarity's sake, although in strict theory he need not. Thus on I, 27: *ornatum Prisc. O²Q²G²J oratum O¹Q¹G¹*. In such a case, the superscript "one" would have told us that these MSS were corrected "correctly." (Incidentally, this case illustrates the usual divergences between our *apparatus critici*. Diels and Martin say that the right reading appears in corrected *OQG*, Bailey in corrected *OQ*, and Ernout only in corrected *O*. I find, from reproductions, that in *O* the word itself was changed into the "correct" reading, and that in *Q vel oratum* is superscript. I have no facsimiles of *G* available.) Sometimes, if I mistake not, even Martin is confused by his own system's potential economy. Thus on I, 29 he gives: *militiai Prisc. O²Q²G²J militia OQ*. But should not these last two be *O¹Q¹*? As we said earlier, he might even have reduced it to: *militiai Prisc. militia O¹Q¹*, since the superscript "ones" indicate that these MSS are corrected "correctly" and since by elimination we assume *GJ* share Priscian's reading.

So much for how to read the *apparatus*, and for its merits. Now for its contents. It is considerably fuller than that of his 1934 edition, especially in the line of conjectures, and becomes now superior to that in Bailey's 1947 edition. The additions, so far as I can determine, come from the *apparatus* of Diels and Bailey, from recent articles, and doubtless from the published reproductions of *O* and *Q*. These additions seem on the whole judiciously selected. In going over the first two hundred lines fairly closely, I noted the following errors—and heaven knows errors never found more fertile soil than an *apparatus criticus*: 68: "*fana Bern.*" should be "*fana Bentl.*" (did *pietas Teubneriana* inspire him to this?); 71: the same hand that corrected *O* also wrote the superscript *aliter videret*; 74: for *omnes* read *omnem* (I cannot speak about *G* nor, since Merrill, "The Italian Manuscripts of Lucretius," Part II, *C.P.C.P.*, IX [1927], pp. 47-83 says nothing about the *Itali* here, can I speak about *J*); 103: the nota is not for *vel* but for *id est*—an important difference! 177: *creantur O²* should be *creatur O²*.

To give a more general picture of Martin's text, I note his readings in some of the famous cruces. In II, 42 for EPICVRI he adopts Munro's *et ecum vi*. In the puzzling passage about the

"Phrygian Curetes," in II, 629 ff., Martin like Bailey follows Diels' solution—surely the best way out until evidence to support the meaning of the MSS turns up. In the last line of Book II Martin reads *capulum*; I still feel that something is to be said for the robust and homely metaphor of *scopulum*. In place of the traditional *eripitur persona, manet res* of III, 58, Martin prints *eripitur persona † manare*. In the *apparatus* he suggests *manu a re*. I wish he had indicated how to translate this. If it means any thing like "forcefully from reality," then that idea would seem opposed to the general sentiment of the passage. In III, 444 Woltjer's excellent *incohibens sit* is adopted for the difficult *incohibescit* of the MSS. In III, 962 he reads *age dum, magnis concede necessis*. Most, I believe, would rather keep the MSS' *nece*. In that case, *magnis* must almost surely go. To add one more suggestion, my own master, Professor E. K. Rand, orally proposed *gnaris*. This is palaeographically acceptable, and compare Horace's *Vivere si recte nescis, decede peritis* (*Epist.*, II, 2, 213). In the much-debated theatre scene of IV, 79, Martin reads *patrum matrumque deorsum* (adopting Bernays' *deorsum* for *deorum*). The *matrum* especially bothers me, but I have nothing to propose, and should probably print what Martin prints. I rejoice to see the *vestem* of the MSS retained in IV, 147 and 152. "Veil" will fit the sense here; it is hard to see how *vitrum* would become corrupted into *vestem*; it is even harder to see why the same corruption should occur in two lines. In the moving passage about the Molossian dogs and their puppies (V, 1068), Martin keeps the text of OQ: *aut ubi eos lactant, pedibus morsuque potentes*. This may surprise readers used to *iactant* and *petentes*. But Martin's punctuation is adroit: "or when they wheedle them, even though they are strong in foot and bite." Possible confusion in rustic capitals between "L" and "I" is perhaps not enough support for the usual change to *iactant*, and I, for one, am attracted by Martin's text (though I agree with Bailey that "the picture seems rather of the mother's play with her puppies when she pretends [*imitantur*] to toss and bite them." Nor am I specially moved by Martin's note on dog-lore: *neque tamen iactant canes pedibus catulos neque dentibus petunt*). Finally, in "perhaps the most desperate textual crux in the poem" (Bailey), V, 1442, in place of *propter odores* Martin reads *navibus ponti*. I have no comment on this, since I cannot see how *propter odores* (which cannot be right here, since Lucretius cannot have meant that the search for spices was the only reason people took up navigation; see Bailey *ad loc.*) ever got into the text here in the first place (certainly not from II, 417).

By now I hope that, despite my murmurs about the transpositions, I have made clear my high estimate of this edition. Its text, if not startling, seems as good as most of the best. The bibliography, the *testimonia vitae*, the *capitula*, the collection of *testimonia* to the text, and the wonderfully full *apparatus* are unique in such an average-sized single volume. Since in many cases no one of us is likely to be very sure just what Lucretius wrote, it is *testimonia* and a large *apparatus* that we need—for an undergraduate course as much as for a seminar in Lucretius.

J. P. ELDER.

MAX POHLENZ. Die griechische Tragödie. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage. Vol. I: Textband; Vol. II: Erläuterungsband. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954. Pp. 501; 203.

The first edition appeared in 1930. In the first volume of the second edition, the bulk of the text has been retained intact, but there has been some recasting, and a good deal of material has been added. In the second volume, of notes, there are far more additions, including references to subsequent scholarship and new texts. The organization remains the same; it is generally chronological, and each play is first summarized and then discussed. In the first volume, Greek is regularly translated. The restrictions of war time have evidently kept most of the recent work in English and French from being available to the author; the studies referred to are almost all in German or Italian. The point of view, postulates, and opinions remain, as the author states and as I have found everywhere I have checked, substantially the same as they were in the first edition.

The dimensions and range of this book, and the reputation of the author, suggest that it ought to take its place as one of the standard works, perhaps *the* standard work, on Greek tragedy, and there is enough erudition, careful scholarship, wisdom, and even wit, to qualify it. Such was the book Pohlenz meant to write. Of tragedy, he has said: "Doch fehlt es an einem zusammenfassenden Werke, das ihr Wesen und ihre Entwicklung darzustellen unternimmt. Diese Lücke möchte das vorliegende Buch ausfüllen" (Preface to the first edition, reprinted in the second). But the book which he produced is not a comprehensive or complete account of tragedy; it is subordinated to special pleading for the thesis that Greek tragedies are essentially religious and ethical documents or enactments. The book is therefore one-sided.

Tragedy, says Pohlenz, is "Gottesdienst," in its origin, for Aeschylus and Sophocles, and until Euripides broke it free from its religious context and "profaned" it. Being bound to such service, the poet was bound to give his audience a piece of moral education. Aeschylus was a Prophet with a sacred calling who displayed before his people the "heilige Geschichte" (p. 140¹ and elsewhere). Sophocles, like Aeschylus a supremely patriotic Athenian, found his true mission as religious educator of his people (p. 352 and elsewhere) who dealt reverently with these same heilige Geschichte and never allowed himself to doubt the goodness of the gods (p. 232 and elsewhere).

Let us examine these propositions. First, no one can dispute the fact that tragedy was authorized and performed under religious auspices (like, e.g., the athletic games), nor that Greek tragedy abounds in speculations (not always favorable) about the nature of the gods, nor that it makes lavish uses of oracles, portents, dreams and visions, of religious ceremonies, prayers, and invocations, nor that the whole atmosphere is generally more sacred and less secular than for modern drama. But the use of religious themes is no necessary guarantee of religious feeling. *Helen* has the tomb as a sacred altar of refuge, a divine miracle at the outset and heavenly exposi-

¹ References are to pages in Volume I, where the general statement is regularly made.

tors at the end, but Pohlenz himself points out, quite rightly, that it is not a religious play. It is more important to point out that the religious setting does not by itself make the quality of tragedy. A mass has its dramatic aspects, but it is not drama. What it specifically lacks is the story, the articulate action. That, says Pohlenz, is here supplied by the heilige Geschichte. This term is at least misleading and probably quite unjustified. It appears to be a translation of Herodotus' term, *ἱρὸς λόγος*. Herodotus uses this term three times (II, 51, 4; 62, 2; 81, 2), each time in connection with a religious mystery which he has no intention of divulging. Plato uses it of the legends which recount the judgment of the soul after death (*Epistles*, 335 a). At a pinch, then, the term could be used of the Homeric *Nekyia* or the *aitia* of certain plays; indiscriminate application to the stories of the Epic Cycle, to the legend of Thebes or the tales of Ajax and Philoctetes, is utterly unwarranted and tendentious. These stories are legends, or ancient or medieval history.

Next, Pohlenz seems much of the time to equate "religious" with "moral." The Greeks, like other people, constantly struggled, without complete success, to square all the data of their religion with their own ethical principles. This does not mean that every dramatic story establishes a moral position, although it is quite true that divine manifestations and moral issues, mostly in conjunction, are pondered again and again through the plays. On these matters, Pohlenz constantly shows care and shrewdness in particular observations, but the value of these is defeated by generalizations which are not only sweeping but ignore the attested meanings of words. A good case is the doctrine of *ἵβρις*, a term which Pohlenz (by no means alone) consistently misapplies.² Truly, the "hybris-pattern," wrongly termed though it is, is one element of tragedy. At least, it is true that great men fall, and the fact invites moralizing. The

² Hybris, says Pohlenz (p. 16) occurs when mortals overpass the limits of humanity in challenge of the gods. The tragic poets and Herodotus use the term constantly, but the above meaning, so dear to the hearts of modern critics, is exceedingly hard to find in tragedy. The best case is the Nurse's remark in *Hippolytus*; Pohlenz reads this as a travesty of the true thought (p. 272). Elsewhere, he consistently uses hybris where the poets do not, and ignores it where they do, since it constantly does not mean what he wants it to mean. Thus he applies it, in *Ajax*, to that hero's disrespectful attitude toward the gods (p. 181). Sophocles does not; hybris in *Ajax* refers to his rough treatment of the (defenceless) flocks and their protectors, or the Achaeans' treatment of Ajax and his family (now nearly defenceless). Of Heracles, on the other hand, Pohlenz says we do not hear "von dieser Hybris" (p. 206). No, we do not; but we do hear Heracles accused of hybris (*Trach.* 280) and it means "foul play," i. e., murdering a friend while he was looking in the opposite direction. (Hybris also describes an act of Deianeira, *Trach.* 888; it means self-murder). Semele, says Pohlenz (p. 131) committed hybris by challenging the envy of Hera. Wrong. The hybris was Hera's (*Bacch.* 9), i. e., causing her rival to be blown to bits. I do not think Pohlenz uses hybris correctly once in the book, and he uses it a great many times. He has the majority of scholars with him, but he can read his own Greek and read it supremely well; he is incapable of such abuse of his well-loved and well-learned language, except in the interests of a preconceived position for which there is insufficient evidence.

articulate Greeks of the fifth century were constantly thinking of pride and fall. How could they help it, remembering Xerxes, Datis, and Mardonius, and also Miltiades, Themistocles, Pausanias, Leutychides, and Cimon? But the fall of the great appears in tragedy, when it does appear, as a moral *action*, not a moral proposition, and thus as one of the types of tragic action which, *when made as a play*, becomes tragedy.

This brings us to the claims that Aeschylus was an inspired seer, that Sophocles (also Euripides) was first and foremost the educator of his people. It is perfectly true that Aristophanes at one point says, or implies, that the primary duty of the dramatic poet is to instruct his people,³ and it is quite in order for Pohlenz to use this passage for all it is worth. It is perfectly true that Aristophanes held firmly to that assignment in his own work and, with the aid of a parabasis in which he could speak his own mind plain, and with the privilege of using contemporary characters and up-to-the-minute issues, he succeeds time after time in driving home the point he wishes to make. It is also perfectly true that the poets in extant tragedies sometimes (not usually) push forward their own unmistakable views on politics or morals in the course of their plays. But when they do, they must, in order to make good *drama*, involve their principles in the action, or make them grow from the action. Failure to do so means a *Heracleidae* or a *Suppliants* (Euripidean). Aristotle saw this plainly, whatever else he saw or failed to see.

Aeschylus, says Pohlenz, again and again, was not only "Erzieher," but "Seher" and "Prophet." If he meant by this a prophet like Cassandra, he would have hit on a striking truth, but he seems to be thinking more of someone like Nathan. Aeschylus was a religious man and he said much about Zeus. In *Prometheus Bound* he gave him more hard knocks than the *Lyomenos* could ever make good. In the first stasimon of *Agamemnon* (sometimes called the "Hymn to Zeus," but Pohlenz can see it is no such thing) the wise Zeus of experience is also the presently-reigning champion of a rough-and-tumble contest. In *Suppliants*, the exaltations of Zeus are put in the mouths of the barbarian and rather barbarous young women, who are characters in the play speaking in character, who love authority, who have their own axe to grind, and who are trying their best to make a democratically-minded Greek king act like an oriental despot. The Greek king in answer deprecates that kind of authority. I do not mean any nonsense like a rationalistic attack on Zeus. No, Zeus, and other Olympians, and the shining Hesiodic abstractions, Peitho and Ate and Hybris and Dike, become characters in drama. Gottesdienst serves tragedy, not the other way around.

To look for the religious or moral lesson of even Aeschylean tragedy and so find its force is the approach that has produced the distortions, evasions, and contradictions of modern criticism. Is

³ *Frogs* 1053-5 with 1009-10. The former proposition is put into the mouth of Aeschylus, a dramatic character who, though he is something more than "a malicious fool," as Verrall contended, still at times palpably misrepresents the real Aeschylus. The statements in question are no true evidence for the attitude of any tragic poet.

Seven Against Thebes a particularly religious play (or, despite Gorgias and Aristophanes, a play which will make the audience feel militant)? If it is a moral play, is it a play with a moral? What is it? Is Eteocles being rewarded for his obvious merits, punished for his obvious faults, or neither, or both? Does the force of the play have anything in particular to do with any of these propositions?

Grant for argument what I will not grant for fact, that Pohlenz has correctly stated Aeschylus' chief position and his attitude toward his art. He has still left out (or nearly; he gives it about two pages in about 110) what makes Aeschylus Aeschylus; namely, the imagination, and the versifier's gift, the artist's patient and powerful work, which makes us see and hear and feel the vast scenes of the *Oresteia's* choral lyrics. The moral feeling does not drive out delight, and the imagination of beauty is not confined to the morally good. Pohlenz has great sympathy for his pious poet when the latter was faced with much of the "grausen Mythen" of Greek tradition. How they must have pained his moral feelings (p. 80)! Did they indeed? I rather think he revelled in the hideous Erinyes, the Lemnian murders, the banquet of Thyestes; and it is evident that, as his own disapproving elders luxuriate in the imagination of Helen's loveliness, and as the poet knew so well how to display the splendors of Clytaemestra's passion, or to parade the sex appeal (no other term will serve) of the Danaids, he knew better than most the lust of the eye and the fascination of the flesh. We may say about the foregoing what Pohlenz has said about Aeschylus' prophetic calling (p. 140): who understands not this understands not Aeschylus.

Sophocles was "Erzieher." What are the lessons we learn from his extant tragedies? In the case of *Electra*, Pohlenz has a very clear answer (pp. 322-23). *If your mother is as nasty a piece of goods as Clytaemestra, it is quite all right to murder her.* Enough said. *The Trachinians* gives him more trouble, but he bravely comes up with a pious conclusion. "In all this there is nothing but Zeus" means that the audience is urged "sich in Gottes Willen zu fügen, mag er auch unbegreiflich sein" (p. 207). Is that what the character who speaks the lines, Hyllus (or the chorus) can be understood to mean when he speaks the lines? With ἀίσχρὰ δ' ἐκείνοις? Go back to the speech and read it and see whether you can make it mean that. Is the poet personally attacking Zeus? Not necessarily, and there Pohlenz is right. If Hyllus (rather than the chorus) did not feel bitter in these circumstances, he would not be human. This is a play, not a sermon. But as it stands, it is not good evidence for the "unbeirraren Glauben des Dichters, dass die Götter, so Schweres auch den Menschen trifft, es doch gut mit ihm meinen" (p. 232). What is the moral of *Ajax*? Why is our sympathy directed to the massive, murderous egoist? Why is Menelaus made so repulsive, while every word of his complaint against Ajax is true and represents the interest of the community? Or, what program can we extract for dealing with the current situation of the unassimilated aristocrat? None; except, bury him when he is dead. But the situation makes a drama. Consider the end of *Oedipus at Colonus*. Religious feeling? Yes indeed, superbly used. Religious enlightenment? If so, what? Moral edification? Ditto. The old tyrant goes

out grandly, a good friend to his friends and a good hater of his enemies to the last, leaving audience or reader stunned. If ever there was a man of the theatre, this was Sophocles.⁴

Pohlenz has a considerable tenderness for the patriotic plays of Euripides, and looks back wistfully from the period of the later "artistic" (the term is scarcely respectable) dramas to the heartier days of *Heracleidae* and *Suppliants* (pp. 364, 429). Patriotism is moral, and religion is moral, ergo patriotism is religious (for a specific case of this inference, see the discussion of Aeschylus' epitaph, p. 39). The jingo of *Heracleidae* pleases him. He never questions Euripides' sincerity, artistic or otherwise. Iolaus is not funny; he reminds Pohlenz of the martial grayheads he saw in Germany in 1914. Otherwise, on Euripides Pohlenz is exceedingly instructive. That this poet considered himself, among other things, an "Erzieher" of the people, is not open to doubt; that, plainly, is sometimes what is the matter with him. Beyond this, Pohlenz has wisely refrained from trying to fix once for all and summarize Euripides' religious and ethical position, as he did for Sophocles with "the gods are good and kind." Once Pohlenz has decided that Euripides has made tragedy "profane" (right) his excellent talent for dramatic analysis and character analysis is set free. He can see, for instance, that Menelaus in *Helen* is both worthy and stuffy; he could only see that Andromache in *Andromache* and Macaria in *Heracleidae* were worthy.

Aristotle, Pohlenz thinks, failed to appreciate the religious aspects of tragedy. Pohlenz fails in part, as this long and dreary polemic has tried to show, to appreciate the dramatic. It is easier, in writing for a wide public, to write about morals and the gods. There is another whole side to the study of the drama, namely the study of its anatomy and its patterns, of what makes drama dramatic, of the uses of surprise and discovery in the familiar, which includes the use of sacred motives—oracles, dreams, sacrifices, and ceremonies—as motives of dramatic fiction. Pohlenz is qualified to deal with this in detail. He is, for instance, on the point of discovering that *Oedipus* is a tragedy mounted on the frame of a romantic comedy. But the implications of such a theory do not interest him; mere contrivance or craftsmanship would be beneath the high moral purpose of a Sophocles. Still, there is much good observation on dramatics scattered through this book. What I miss more is an awareness and exploitation of what Aristotle, too, slighted; namely, the poetry. Pohlenz can leave his moral obsession long enough to note the fragmentation of *Andromache*, but not the mediocrity of the writing. Or again: "Euripides ist es, der dem lyrischen Element in der Tragödie erst zur vollen Wirkung verhalf" (442). An illuminating remark, and quite true if lyric means pretty songs; but we now see why the choral lyric of Aeschylus means, as lyric, so little to Pohlenz, and why almost everything he says about Aeschylus, and Sophocles, would apply equally well if they had written nothing but prose. Attic tragedy began with poetry; there is no modern book

⁴ These remarks merely restate the substance of Norwood's final paragraph in his review of Whitman's *Sophocles*, in this Journal, LXXIV (1953), pp. 172-3. But the point is worth restating, though I can never state it so well.

on tragedy which begins with poetry or ends with poetry. There probably never will be; but until there is, that comprehensive and authoritative study of tragedy which Pohlenz hoped to write will never be written.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

FRANÇOIS CHAMOUX. *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades*. Paris, 1953. Pp. 420; 28 pls. (*Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 177.)

The history of the Greek colony at Cyrene on the Libyan coast of north Africa presents a variety of interesting questions for early Greek history. What led the Greeks to this particular area, motives of trade or a search for new agricultural land? How were their institutions and culture affected by the connections with Greece, Egypt, and the native Libyans? Why did the monarchy established at the time of colonization last so long (until ca. 440 B. C.) there, when it had disappeared nearly everywhere else in the Greek world at a much earlier date? Happily, Chamoux is aware of the significance of these and other questions so that his book is planned and written with a scope which enables them to be properly formulated and discussed. He has drawn on the full range of existing evidence, literary, epigraphical, and archaeological, supplemented by his own visits to the site. While the author modestly disclaims technical competence in all this varied material he rightly insists on its pertinence for his theme: an attempt to write a general history of early Cyrene from the resources available to modern scholarship. The book is a very broad synthesis of the history of early Cyrene up to the fall of the Battiad monarchy with detailed discussion of many special problems. By way of introduction we are given a brief geographical sketch of the area and a history of its excavation with critical bibliography. The history proper is divided into a narrative and cultural section. In the latter the social organization and economic development, the religious activity and the sculpture are discussed. As an appendix there is an account of the treasury of Cyrene at Olympia. The book is thoroughly indexed and the site and archaeological material illustrated by 28 plates. To the reviewer the chief defect seems to be a too equal allocation of space between the trivial and the important in the historical sections and too much descriptive material for the archaeological. The result is an excessively long book for the subject which tends to obscure the valuable treatment and conclusions on certain topics. Chamoux has been properly catholic in the breadth of his evidence, but might have refined it more thoroughly in the presentation.

Colonization. The various problems of the colonization are fully discussed and sensibly resolved. The author follows the Herodotean account, rejecting the various legendary notices of earlier expeditions and accepting the Eusebian (Eratosthenes) date of 637 for the landing on the island of Plataea (Bomba) and 631 for the foundation of Cyrene itself. The scanty archaeological evidence is

in general agreement, but Chamoux cautiously points out how slight the investigation of early levels has been on the site. While Chamoux denies that motives of trade had any share in the colonization, he plausibly suggests (to account for the Cretan pilotage of the expedition) that the Cretans had used Plataea as a purple-fishing station. Certainly the indications in the literary sources—drought and presumably famine in Herodotus (IV, 150-3) and the allocation of one son from each Theraean family to the enterprise (Foundation Stele; *S.E.G.*, IX, 3, 29) support Chamoux's view that overpopulation and lack of land in Thera were the main motives for the expedition. Yet, the suggestion of Cretan purple-fishing off the Libyan coast accords well with the slight indications of pre-colonization trading in other parts of the Mediterranean: Spanish (the Jerez and Huelva helmets); southern France (the late seventh century East Greek pottery from the area of Marseilles and the Riviera); the Black Sea (East Greek pottery from inland sites such as Nemirov near Kiev and from Ak Alan near Samsun, which predates the earliest material from the colonies). Perhaps Chamoux is too hasty in rejecting Milne's theory (*J.E.A.*, XXV [1938], pp. 177 f.) of a pre-colonization trade in exotics brought by a caravan route from the Sudan. It is rather difficult to explain the Samian colony in Oasis (Herod., III, 26) as founded by Samian mercenaries for a pleasant retreat in their old age. The mercenaries are plausible, but it seems more reasonable to interpret the settlement as a desert outpost for the function of protecting a water supply on the analogy of Tell Defenneh. Be this as it may, we can agree that the caravan trade would only assume some importance after the foundation of Cyrene when it could use that city as a terminus. For the Theraeans, if not the Cretans, the desire for new land was probably the chief motive in prompting the expedition.

Political History. Chamoux includes in the political narrative a study of Herodotus' interest in Cyrenaean history (pp. 153-9) and a chapter of historical commentary on Pindar's *Pythian Odes* IV, V, and IX which celebrated the victory of Telesicrates the Cyrenaean in 474 and of Arcesilaus IV in 462 (pp. 169-201). Herodotus forms the basis for the narrative as far as his account goes, to the death of Arcesilaus III, shortly after 525 B. C., but thereafter the shreds of literary and archaeological evidence are patched together neatly. A possible weak spot in the chronological reconstruction is the connection of Arcesilaus III and Polycrates of Samos. Chamoux ascribes Arcesilaus' recruitment of volunteers in Samos for his restoration to a natural affinity of interest between tyrants and accepts the date of 532-1 for Polycrates' accession to power. The inception of a tyranny in Samos, however, seems to have been rather earlier, perhaps in the generation before Polycrates (White, *J.H.S.*, LXXIV [1954], pp. 36-43). One difficulty in accepting a date after 530 for the appeal is the too great compression of events between Arcesilaus' restoration and his submission to Cambyses. That is one of the few well-attested dates in Cyrenaean history. On the other hand Chamoux considers that Arcesilaus' birth can hardly be placed earlier than ca. 550 B. C. on a reconstruction of the Herodotean account. Thus, some caution is necessary in using Chamoux's chronological reconstruction.

After the successful establishment of the colony the first important political change in Cyrene was the result of the influx of new immigrants *ca.* 580 B. C. Greeks from the Peloponnesus, Crete, and the Aegean islands migrated to the city at the invitation of Battus II to convert it from a purely Theraean colony to a cosmopolitan city-state. This influx precipitated conflict with the Libyans, for their land had to provide the lots for the new settlers; it also provoked internal strife between the old settlers, solidly established as landed proprietors, and the new arrivals. To solve the difficulties Demonax of Mantinea was invited to arbitrate. A new civic organization was created by the establishment of three new tribes, presumably replacing the traditional Doric *phylae*. Members were assigned on the basis of origin: Theraeans and perioeci (interpreted by Chamoux as Greek laborers on the large estates), Peloponnesians and Cretans, Islanders. While the new members were made members of the state by their tribal affiliations they do not seem to have come out very well in political privilege, for the king who had invited them was stripped of his political power and an oligarchy of Theraean land-owners was established in control of the magistracies. Chamoux's ascription of all this activity to the arbitration of Demonax seems rather too inclusive; stripping the king of his political powers was a sorry return by Demonax, and the creation of new tribes seems to imply more political equality between new comers and old settlers than emerged in the sequel. Perhaps Demonax gave the tribes equal rights (which would account for Herodotus' phrase, ἐς μέσον τῷ δήμῳ ἔθηκε, IV, 161) and the resentment of the Theraean land-owners led to a successful revolution against the king and the new settlers on whom he based his power. In any case, this quarrel between the two elements in the state seems to be the motif for further Cyrenaean development. The successor of Battus II, Arcesilaus III, enlisted the commons in an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the oligarchy. He was more successful with Samian volunteer soldiers who were promised lands, evidently to be confiscated from the large estates. Thus, the later Cyrenaean monarchy took on the form of a typical Greek tyranny with popular support, foreign mercenaries, and finally, a double guarantee when Arcesilaus became a subject of Cambyses after the latter had defeated Amasis of Egypt. Cyrene thus became a tributary of the Persian Empire which evidently contributed to its well-being and prosperity as shown by the growth of trade, building activity, and the coinage of the late sixth and early fifth centuries. Despite this and the fact that the welfare of the "tyranny" was founded on Persian support, Chamoux argues that Cyrene successfully declared its independence shortly after the Persian defeats of 480 rather than at the time of the revolt of Egypt under Inaros and the Athenian intervention. The evidence is very slight and indirect (p. 167) and on the whole the usual view which accepts the latter date seems preferable. The monarchy itself came to an end very soon after the Egyptian revolt had forced a relaxation of Persia's hold on Egypt. It is interesting to note that throughout this period of Cyrenaean history the political institutions of the state remained thoroughly Doric, while its art followed first the lead of Cycladic and Ionian centers, then after 550 of Athens with whom Cyrene's trade relations became very close. Perhaps the strongly Doric char-

acter of the institutions is the result of the oligarchical control asserted at the expense of the new colonists. While the slight evidence gives ground for disagreement with Chamoux's conclusions it is fairly and fully presented.

Society and Economy. Chamoux's treatment of this topic is valuable and interesting. The vigor of the colony is well attested by the secondary foundations of Barce and Euhesperides and the extent of the territory exploited by the Greeks. They seem to have farmed it partly by manorial estates (*pyrgoi*), partly by small owners living in villages (*komai*). The exploitation was in Greek hands and Chamoux emphasizes the Hellenic character of the city despite the evidence of intermarriage with the Libyans and their proximity. Yet his interpretation of the *perioeci* as Greeks and not Hellenized natives seems doubtful (pp. 223-5). His chief objection to this orthodox view is that Greek cities did not admit barbarian aliens to their citizen bodies, and the *perioeci* were a part of the Theraean tribe. Certainly the cities in mainland Greece did not, but they had no occasion to do so; in Asia Minor native elements were admitted to the civic organizations as the cases of Samos and Ephesus attest, yet those cities remained essentially Greek. Also, in the archaic period there was little of the anti-barbarian sentiment among the Greek aristocracy popular after the Persian Wars. Chamoux interprets Cyrenaean economy as almost entirely based on agriculture. Its exports were cereals, wool, and silphion and Athens the best customer. This seems sound in view of the pronounced effect of Athenian coinage on that of Cyrene and the marked Athenian influence on the sculpture and minor arts. The Cyrenaean trade with Egypt is minimized and the presence of Cyrenaean coins in the Egyptian hoards explained as part of the tribute paid to Persia. That part of the tribute would filter down into the merchant's hoards is possible, if Persia paid her mercenary troops with the silver rather than sending it on to the treasury, but inscriptions from Naukratis attest the residence there of Cyrenaeans and there were Egyptian or oriental goods obtainable in Egypt which Cyrene needed to purchase. It did not need wheat, but what of linen, papyrus, and the minor *objets de luxe* which characterized the Egyptian trade? A chapter is devoted to silphion without identifying that mysterious plant but Chamoux's explanation of the organization of the commerce seems fresh and convincing. Silphion grew in the Libyan area rather than the Greek and Chamoux suggests that it came into Greek hands as tribute paid to the king. The scene on the Arcesilaus' kylix is considered to represent the payment of the tribute to the king who supervises its weighing and storage in an underground chamber while he sits on land under the shade of an awning, not on board a ship taking in cargo. In general, then, Cyrene's prosperity is found in its agricultural resources for its own consumption and export, not in its position for transit trade along the coast of Africa, nor in its industrial products. "Cyrenaean" pottery remains Laconian.

Religion. The section on the cults correlates the scanty literary evidence with the almost equally scanty archaeological remains. Among the latter are the very interesting sculptured, but faceless, female busts found in the cemetery which date in a series from the

late sixth century (pp. 293-300). They are interpreted as representing an *anodos*, perhaps the veiled figure of Ge rising from the ground and as such the object of a cult. Most important of the temples was the largest Greek temple in Africa, that of Zeus Ammon. It was comparable in size to the Zeus temple in Olympia and the Parthenon in Athens and is dated by Chamoux a generation before them, in the late sixth century (p. 327). This important cult apparently represented an assimilation of Zeus and the Egyptian Ammon of Siwah. Yet there is little evidence for other Egyptian or Libyan influence in religious practice. The city remained Greek in religion as in civic institutions and art.

Sculpture. Chamoux's discussion of the sculpture is based on his study of the pieces stored on the site. Those catalogued and discussed are of excellent quality, comparable to good Greek work in the main centers of production. The sculpture offers an almost uninterrupted series from the late seventh to the third century and, since its style keeps pace with Greek developments, Cyrene must have offered attractive opportunities to travelling Greek sculptors. It was very much of a luxury art in Cyrene since all the marble had to be imported, for the local shelly limestone makes poor material. The earliest marble piece, a *kouros*, of ca. 600-590 is related by its head to the Dipylon head and by its body to the *kouros* of Thera and to island work of the early sixth century. Attic influence is paramount from 550 and Egyptian almost completely lacking.

Cyrene is thus an interesting example of colonial development. The political institutions and social organization remained Doric despite the influx of Ionian colonists from the Aegean islands and intermarriage with and the proximity of the Libyan natives. The cults are similarly little influenced by Egyptian and native practices. The art is not Doric, but follows the currents of trade, to the Cyclades and Samos before 550, to Athens after that date. In the case of the Greek colonies Chamoux has made it clear that "influences" worked on different levels. Either the literary or the archaeological evidence is only half the story.

CARL ROEBUCK.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

VICTOR MARTIN. *Papyrus Bodmer, I: Iliade, Chants 5 et 6.* Zürich, Artemis Verlag, 1954. Pp. 90; 6 pls. (*Bibliotheca Bodmeriana*.)

An excellent review of this book has been published by Reinhold Merkelbach in *Gnomon*, XXVII (1955), pp. 269-75. I am greatly pleased by this fact; because it permits me to pass over some important matters more or less completely, and thus to save space for the mention of others in which, for the moment at least, I am more interested. Indeed, I have delayed my work in order to profit by what Merkelbach has done.

Thus, for instance, there is no need for me to tell in detail of the rich collection that Martin Bodmer has formed of items prized both by collectors of curios and by students of literature; nor of

the efforts he has generously made to share them with a wide circle of readers. I have, however, the pleasure of congratulating Switzerland on numbering among her citizens a man of such abilities and tastes, and also of expressing to him my gratitude for access to documents that must interest greatly every student of the problems that group around the name Homer.

The opening section of this book (pp. 7-22) is headed *Description* (pp. 9-20) but, in addition to what that would lead one to expect, it includes also a discussion of the two ways in which Homeric papyri are of importance to us—their *aspect philologique* and their *aspect bibliologique*. Martin believes that papyrologists have been slighting the latter, while devoting time to the former. This seems partly a special application of the old maxim that cobblers should stick to their lasts. I will agree to the extent that a good part of the contribution papyrologists strive to make to the solution of Homeric problems is a waste of energy. I hasten, however, to add that much of the trouble springs from the bad example set by Homericists.

I shall begin with the curious obsession that an athetesis by Aristarchus was a directive to future copyists to omit the line(s), and that obedience to it is to be expected in later copies. That idea goes back to the beginning of the 19th century, when only the readings of medieval MSS were available for testing the theory. Difficulties were met in three ways: (1) an athetesis by anybody else would do, if one by Aristarchus was not at hand; (2) if there was no report of an athetesis, a statement that a line was not in the edition of Aristarchus (or of somebody else) would serve equally well; and (3) *in extremis* it could be assumed that an athetesis must have existed.

Three score years and ten ago Ludwich (*Aristarchs hom. Textkritik*, II, pp. 132-43) argued against the theory, and said (p. 133, n. 110): "Es sollte eigentlich unnötig sein, dergleiche elementare Dinge noch besonders zur Sprache zu bringen: leider ist es das aber nicht." Unfortunately it continued for a long time to be needed. Three philologists, whom I respect most highly, Blass, Wecklein, Wilamowitz, kept on trying to establish a connection between a medieval blunder in copying and the conduct of some Alexandrian. Specimens are given in *External Evidence*, pp. 4-7. None of them made full use of the papyrus evidence then available. The sort of thing Blass might have done may be inferred from his note (*Arch. Pap.*, III [1906], p. 259) on the stichometry of P 21 = 596 (Pack). Zeta in our texts has 529 lines but this papyrus gives $\phi\kappa\epsilon$ as the total. Blass comments: "Athetiert wurden nach den Scholien in dem ganzen Buche nur 433-439, indes das sind 7 Verse. Leider ist im Papyrus das ϵ unsicher."

In 1906 Grenfell and Hunt showed that *ca.* 150 there was a great change in the Homeric papyri. The longer texts of the type found in the earlier papyri ceased abruptly and almost completely. A new type of text appeared, one that contained "substantially" the same combination of lines that is found in the medieval manuscripts. That is the key to understanding the transmission of 'Homer.' The work progressed, and in 1931 Allen was able to make a good statement of the case: Aristarchus' signs "did not have the effect of removing lines from the text—and were not intended to do so.

Hence we do not expect to find, and do not find, Aristarchus' athetesis followed by omission in the text" (*Iliad*, I, p. 197).¹

Then came the papyrologists, but unfortunately with the theory that 19th century Homericists had clung to in spite of Ludwig. In *Athetized Lines*, pp. 20-1 I listed errors of that sort by two men whom I admire.

To show that this sort of thing is not—as yet—given up, I shall use some examples² from a series (nos. 1-32) of papyri, carefully edited by Jacques Schwartz, *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, XLVI (1946), pp. 29-71; LIV (1954), pp. 45-71. In LIV, pp. 56-7 is an attempt to explain a mark, described (p. 54) as a Γ peut-être, in the margin opposite A 310, as a stichometric mark, leading to an inference that 10 lines had been dropped before A 215 the first line preserved in No. 23.

The editor lists ten atheteses of Aristarchus from A 1-214, making the mistake of counting 133-4 as one line, and of omitting 177 entirely—cf. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, I, p. 185; Leaf, *ad loc.*; my *Athetized Lines*, p. 54. He also fails to consider lines 215-99, still extant, from which 265, 266, 296 were omitted. The two last are added in a hand that wrote in small uncials—the editor (p. 55) cannot determine whether it is the scribe himself or a second hand. In the latter case certainly, in the former probably, they should have been included in his calculation.

A 373 ends with 'Απόλλωνος, A 380 with 'Απόλλων; the first hand of no. 23 skipped 374-80. The uncial hand did a poor job in correcting it. The only athetesis in the neighborhood is Aristarchus' of A 366-92, cf. *Ath. Lines*, pp. 59-61. Obviously there is no connection between the facts. I am not sure of what the editor wishes to do with it. Any attempt to find in it support for the idea that an athetesis by Aristarchus works as a directive for cancellation would be a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Over a decade ago I wrote (*Ath. Lines*, p. 21): "Of course it is just a piece of luck that so far no 'blunder' of a copyist has brought about an accidental coincidence between a papyrus and an athetesis. The luck may not hold, and its breakdown will lead to confusion. It cannot, obviously, make nonsense of the text, and a homoeographon need not be present. Even without that help it should be taken, on account of its isolation, for the accident it would be; but I fear there will be arms open to welcome it."

The breakdown has come. Aristarchus athetized A 296 on the testimony of Aristonicus in § A. The scribe of no. 23 omitted the line, and that this is no more than a "blunder" is shown by its correction either in his own or in a later hand. The editor shows no appreciation of the curio his papyrus has brought us.

The second section (pp. 23-31) is headed *Paléographie*. The texts (pp. 33-78) follow, with brief footnotes, giving the readings of

¹ His attempt to list a "few coincidences" is badly bungled, cf. Merkelbach, p. 273. Allen's misprint "Ω 536" is tangled with Ω 556 which (with the following line) was athetized by Aristarchus and is not omitted by any MS; and also with Ω 558 which was not in Aristarchus, and is omitted (according to Allen) by 23 MSS including V¹, V^{2a}, the two he previously cited for the omission of Ω 536.

² See Merkelbach, p. 272, n. 1, for a long list of others in these and in recently published papyri.

other witnesses, and references to the places where Martin has treated the passage more fully. On pages 79-90 is a *Commentaire Philologique*. I shall confine myself to what seem the most interesting topics.

I begin with variants a line in length. Edgerton well says: "Doubtless few mss. are wholly free from accidental omissions (often, but by no means always, explainable by haplography or the like)"—quoted with approval in *Ath. Lines*, p. 9, where the guiding principles are set out in more detail. Omissions of E 172, 233, 584, 669-70, 673 make nonsense of the text; those of E 457, 604 take out lines that are clearly desirable. Haplography is clear at E 669-70, less so at 584, 604 (homoeomeson?), 673. Martin notes, p. 80, that no athetesis has left a trace in the Bodmer papyri. The remark is accurate; but leaves uncertain what sort of a trace he was expecting. I should prefer: gaps prevent the papyrus from testifying at E 64, 183, 187, Z 88-9, 433-7; it contains E 838-9, 906, Z 311, 438-9 (all athetized by Aristarchus) and E 734-6 (by Zenodotus).

Of added lines: Z 386^a is simple dittography; E 180^a is well explained by Martin as being 206, picked up by the scribe's model from an adjacent column; E 522^a (= A 28) makes nonsense; it comes either from an ill-timed recollection of the parallel passage, or by inheritance from a text that had absorbed a marginal note. The writing of E 415-414 in this order is probably mere surface corruption: 414 dropped by a mechanical blunder, 415 written, the fault noted, and 414 then written. Line 415 looks like a metrical gloss on Αἰγιάλεια. It belongs really in the margin; if it is to be brought into the text, it would be best placed after 412, as Cobet, Leaf, and Merkelbach have seen.

All this is mere surface corruption, but very different is the omission of E 808. Here the basic question is whether the line was or was not in the edition of Aristarchus. On this point the scholia contradict one another flatly. Aristonicus in § A says at Δ 390 (= E 808): ὅτι ἐνταῦθα ὑγιῶς τέτακται, ἐν δὲ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πρὸς τὸν Διομήδη λόγῳ οὐκέτι. Thus he asserts that E 808 was read by Aristarchus, and implies that it was athetized. His note on E 807: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος ὑποτάσσει τούτῳ στίχον "ῥηιδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα." ἐναντιοῦται δὲ· ἡ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖα οὐ φησι παροτρύνειν, ἀλλὰ κωλύειν. μετηνέχθη δὲ οὐ δεόντως ἐκ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος³ λόγου (Δ 390). This is in harmony with his previous note, and adds an assertion that E 808 was read by Zenodotus, and an implication that he (Aristonicus) knew, directly or indirectly, of MSS without it. At first blush one might expect a note of Didymus explaining the athetesis of E 808. An understanding of the way the epitomizer of § A worked (cf. *Athetized Lines*, p. 40) will show that it is not to be expected, and it is not found. The T scholia tell a different story: οὐ καθόλου δὲ εὐρέθη ἐν ταῖς Ἀριστάρχου τὸ "ῥηιδίως· τοίη τοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα." ἐναντίον γάρ ἐστι τοῖς προκειμένοις. The B scholia agree except for a less explicit phrase παρ' Ἀριστάρχῳ. The A^t scholium starts by drawing on the source of § BT: τοῦτον τὸν στίχον (E 808) οὐχ εὐρησθαι καθόλου φασὶν ἐν ταῖς Ἀριστάρχου; and then continues with a remark that may go back to the suppressed note of

³ I cannot understand why Martin (p. 80) emends to Ἀθηναῖα.

Didymus: καὶ γὰρ ἀντιπράττει καὶ πρὸς τὸ "δαίνυσθαι μιν . . . ἔκηνον" (805), καὶ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἐπιφέρειν "σοὶ δ' ἦτοι . . . φυλάσσω" (809).

Such is the testimony. If it comes to choosing sides, it should be noted that while § T may have been innocently misled into error by a faulty copy of Aristarchus, Aristonicus must, in all probability, be either telling the truth or lying. I do not regard this as conclusive, but I should hesitate before plumping for § BTA^t, as moderns have generally done.

If one looks for help to the later tradition, the trouble is that he can—with more or less difficulty—argue for either side of the case. Thus the reading by Aristarchus of the line is supported by its presence in P 295 (2/3 p.) and in practically all of the medieval manuscripts. The exception is its absence in V¹⁶ (s. xii) and L⁹ (1452 A.D.). This is explained as "ex homoeomeso" by Allen. The temptation to haplography (τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν : ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ) is perhaps not very great,⁴ but, if it is accepted as sufficient, it will account also for the omission of the line in P 588 Pack (2 p.) and now in P Bodmer. On the other hand if one follows § T and denies E 808 to Aristarchus, P 588 (Pack), P Bodmer, V¹⁶, and L⁹ show what would be expected; while one would be faced with the need of explaining the presence of the line in P 295 and in all the other manuscripts. It could be that before the close of the second century E 808 passed from a scholium to one or more papyri, and spread from them to the medieval manuscripts. What happened at a much later date to © [183]—described in *Language*, XXX (1954), p. 274—would be a parallel. I should leave the case *sub iudice*.⁵

Among the smaller variants I notice first E 785 which appears as

Στέντορι εἰσαμένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἥδ' ἐκ αὐδὴν
ὅς τόσον [αὐδήσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλο]ι πενήκοντα

where Ω has εἰσαμένη μεγάλητορι χαλκεοφώνῳ. There can be no questioning of Martin's restoration, nor of the pertinence of his comparing (p. 83) δέμας καὶ ἀπειρέα φωνήν, N 45, P 555. I may add that no example in the *Iliad* of ἡμὲν . . . ἥδ' would tend to suggest the variant. Where did it come from? Perhaps the key lies in the scholia. Of 786 § T says: ἐν τισιν οὐκ ἦν ὁ στίχος διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ταύτην τὴν ψυχράν. B has the same, but stops with ὑπερβολήν; A agrees with B, but attaches the remark to a scholium on 785—a line which obviously could not be dropped by itself. Now § T at times makes a connecting link between our texts and Ptolemaic papyri. © [183] (cf. above) is one example, and even more striking is B 855^{ab}. For a long time these verses were known only from Strabo, Eustathius, and § T which at Υ 329 quotes them after an introductory phrase τινὲς δὲ καὶ φέρουσι τὸ . . . Then P 40 (3a.) fr. p. was seen to contain them—cf. *External Evidence*, pp. 77-9. Similarly I take the statement of § T about E 786 to mean that some Ptolemaic texts lacked that line, and suspect that in its fuller

⁴ Allen explains an omission of N 458 in the same way; but, as far as I can see, with less, if any reason.

⁵ It may be well to warn that three papyri are so small a sample of those written 150-250 A.D. that inferences about the probable numbers of all papyri cannot be made. All that is certain is that papyri both with and without the line existed at that time.

form a scholium told of the variant ἡμὲν δέμας ἢ δὲ καὶ αὐδὴν, which P Bodmer, directly or indirectly, took over from it.⁶ If this is so, other variants in P Bodmer are entitled to more consideration than would otherwise be given them.

In E 636 P Bodmer points to ἔμμεν' ἐπεὶ (whether one so writes or ἐκ πληροῦς matters little) against the Attic-Ionic εἶναι ἐπεὶ of Ω. Obviously this is no blunder of a scribe, and it is surprising to find an Aeolic form instead of an Attic one. The tide in the tradition sets strongly in the opposite direction. Gehring lists 61 examples of εἶναι in the *Iliad*, and not in one does Allen record a variant. In *Ilias Atheniensium*, p. 15, I referred to the difficulty of determining "how far Π itself was Atticized, and how soon Atticisms were introduced." The papyrus could not have got ἔμμεναι here, unless it had been read by Π; the later domination of εἶναι points to its introduction at an early time. I should now read ἔμμεν' ἐπεὶ for a text of ca. 550 B. C., but εἶναι ἐπεὶ for ca. 150 B. C.; and should treat ἔμμεν' ἐμὸν similarly in E 639. Ludwich cites at 639 ἔμμεν? Nauck; I should have expected Nauck to take the same action at both places. This improvement of the text may lead to matters of further interest, but this is not the place to discuss them.

Disregarding surface corruption we find in P 41c (3a) = 536 Pack:

- E 529 ὦ φίλοι, ἀνέρες ἔστε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔλεσθε,
 530 ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.
 531 αἰδομένων ἀνδρῶν πλέονες σάοι ἢ πέφανται
 532 φεγόντων δ' οὔτ' ἄρ κλέος ὄρνυται οὔτε τις ἀλκή,

and also in P 267 (2 p.) = 578 Pack—its omission of line 532 is recognized as nothing more than surface corruption, cf. Barbara McCarthy, *C. P.*, XXVII (1932), p. 131—and in all manuscripts. Against this background the omission of line 530 in P Bodmer cannot be regarded as more than a blunder.

Martin (pp. 82-3) discusses its relationship to O 561 ff. in a fashion with which I cannot agree. He has been misled by the fact that Wolf and others after him have taken O [562] into their texts, although it should be clear that it is a plus verse added in post-Aristarchean times.

Because of the formular style of the epos we might expect these four lines to be repeated without variation when a similar situation arises. That is not what is found. E 529 is never repeated; a con-

⁶ In passing I now incline to believe that E 785-6 were not in the archetype Π (ca. 550); since in Ptolemaic times line 786 alternated with zero, and 785 circulated in two forms, cf. Didymus *apud* § A at T 327: τεκμήριον δὲ τῆς διασκευῆς τὸ καὶ ἐτέρως φέρεσθαι τὸν στίχον. If one wishes to argue on grounds of "intrinsic probability," there is the ignorance about Stentor. Those who knew him as a Thracian objected that it was Homer's way to have his gods take the form <only> of those present. Others denied this principle; while some met with the difficulty by declaring that Stentor was an Arcadian and adding verses to the Catalog to prove their point. See § ABT on E 785. Present is an elastic term; Calchas and Phoenix are members of the expedition, but never (because of age?) appear on the battlefield. Twice gods appear in their form—the two passages from which δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν is cited. Is this merely a coincidence?

siderable variation of it is found in O 561, and this is used in a different context at O 661. Repetition of E 531-2 gives us:

- O 561 ὦ φίλοι, ἄνδρες ἔστε καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
 563 αἰδομένων ἀνδρῶν πλέονες σάοι ἢ πέφανται,
 564 φευγόντων δ' οὐτ' ἄρ κλέος ὄρνυται οὔτε τις ἀλκή.

Trouble starts when someone remembers the similar passage and writes (E 530) ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας in the margin. The consequence may be seen in P 60 (4 p.) = 671 Pack, where the marginal note passes into the text after O 530 making nonsense; P 48 (5 p.) = 719 Pack is still uncontaminated; nine manuscripts are reported by Ludwig as lacking the line, though in four of them it is added by later hands; Allen lists twenty-seven MSS as omitting the line.⁷ This is ample ground for the opinion expressed above, and already in *External Evidence*, p. 20.

In E 294 the reading of Ω is: ἦριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ while P Bodmer starts with ἦριπε δὲ πρηνής. I begin by trying to determine the associations elsewhere of the two competing phrases. ἦριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων is found most frequently when something more is told about the team: ὑπερώησαν δέ οἱ ἵπποι follows in © 122, 314, O 452; κατὰ δ' ἦνια χεῦν ἔραζε P 619; the slaying of the charioteer—κυκλήθησαν δέ οἱ ἵπποι Y 487. In two other passages the death of the hero completes the line: στυγερὸς δ' ἄρα μιν σκότος εἶλεν E 47; κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς Π 344. At E 75 it is an ἐν ἄλλῳ variant of A for ἦριπε δ' ἐν κονίῃ; and © 260 will be noted below.

On the other hand ἦριπε δὲ πρηνής is found only before ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ E 58. This phrase is usually preceded by δούπησεν δὲ πεσών Δ 504, E [42], N 187; P 50, 311; but at E 540 ἦριπε δὲ πρηνής is a variant with considerable attestation. © 260 reads ἦριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ but there is an ἐν ἄλλῳ variant of A: ὑπερώησαν δέ οἱ ἵπποι that puts it in line with © 122, 314, O 452.

There are smudges on the picture, but the P Bodmer seems to me to conform better to the practice of the *Iliad*.

Reference to Merkelbach may suffice for the new readings in E 616, 753, 855, Z 359. I can agree with his objections at E 477, 603, though I might express mine "a shade the stronger"; at E 486 I should have endorsed Meister's interpretation of ὠρεσσι < ἀόρεσσι enthusiastically on syntactic grounds.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

HARRY CAPLAN. [Cicero] Ad C. Herennium De Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica Ad Herennium) with an English Translation. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd., 1954. Pp. lviii + 433. \$3.00.

There has come down to us in the Ciceronian corpus a spurious treatise on rhetoric entitled variously *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*,

⁷ I feel compelled to admit that I am surprised by the large number. Why is there no mention of additions by later hands?

Rhetorica Secunda, or *Rhetorica Nova*; perhaps more properly, *De Ratione Dicendi*, a title suggested by Marx. With its congener, the *De Inventione*, it had a great vogue in the Middle Ages, and as the earliest work on rhetoric in the canonical form it is a starting point for exploratory journeys in two directions: it points forward to later antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance, and from it we may derive much information about the Hellenistic textbooks which preceded it.

The *Ad Herennium* has been much neglected of late. There is no complete translation in English nor any good commentary. Both these gaps are now filled by the admirable edition before us. Professor Caplan after a lengthy Introduction covering the history of scholarly work on the *Ad Herennium* reaches the following conclusions: the author can only be referred to as Auctor Incertus; the date is 86-82 B. C., after the *De Inventione*. There is no immediate common source in Greek for the two works, but resemblances indicate some common Latin source like the *De Ratione Dicendi* of Antonius. The Auctor Incertus had some originality and did not merely edit notes taken in the classroom. These are conservative and sensible views; in fact throughout the whole book Caplan shows conservatism and sound sense. The Introduction closes with an Analysis—very useful; one needs a road map to travel through the *Ad Herennium*.

The text is in the main that of the *editio minor* of Marx, without the idiosyncrasies of Marx's spelling: e. g. Caplan writes *prooemium* and *ephodos* instead of *prohemium* and *epodos*, and *hae* (nominative plural feminine) instead of Marx's *haec*.

The translation is a sheer delight, clear, vigorous, and idiomatic. If at times it borders on paraphrase, this is not to be put down as a fault of the translator, but is the only way to handle the crabbed, sometimes well-nigh unintelligible Latin of the Auctor Incertus. Caplan has not been afraid to expand his translation of technical terms in the interest of clarity, and the result is wholly admirable. We have only a few suggestions. On page 29 is not "official documents" too narrow for *tabulae*? The latter might mean "wills" or "contracts." On page 77 would not "inquisitor" be a better translation of *quaesitor* than "presiding justice" inasmuch as the matter under discussion is the torture of witnesses? For "men of the jury" (*passim*) the more common phrase in our courts is, I believe, "gentlemen of the jury." On page 269 "Taste" seems to be too broad for *elegantia* of which the sub-heads are *Latinitas* and *explanatio* (clarity). Taste is applicable to the use of figures and in innumerable other parts of a speech. *Elegantia* (from *eligere*) means precision in diction.

We come now to the notes, which are the distinctive mark of this edition. The author has wisely departed from the type of notes usual in a volume of the Loeb Classical Library. We have here a full commentary on a standard work of rhetoric which will be the best introduction one can have to the study of this field of ancient thought. Parallels from ancient works both in Greek and in Latin are complete, and the modern literature on all debatable passages is quoted exhaustively. Scholars will be grateful to Caplan for putting his vast learning in this field at their disposal. I venture only a few remarks: There is confusion in note f on page 5. The text

reads: *Iudiciale . . . habet accusationem aut petitionem cum defensione*; the translation: "The judicial . . . comprises criminal prosecution or civil suit, and defence." The note: *κατηγορία, δίκη, ἀπολογία*. Granted that *accusatio* and *petitio* in Roman Law correspond roughly to our criminal and civil cases, there is no such distinction in Greek. *δίκη* covers cases of murder, theft, and assault as well as many others which we call criminal. A distinction is sometimes made between *γραφή* and *δίκη*, but this is not properly a distinction between criminal and civil, but between causes affecting the state as a whole and causes between individuals. Moreover in either case in Greek the prosecutor or plaintiff is a *κατήγορος* and his speech is a *κατηγορία*. The parallelism between Greek and Latin breaks down at this point.

It is difficult to see the point of the citation from Aeschines in note a on p. 284. The text reads: "Perfidious Fregellae, how quickly, because of your crime, you have wasted away." (An example of apostrophe.) The note: *cf.* the passage, often used by the rhetoricians, in Aeschines *Adv. Ctes.* 133: "But Thebes, Thebes, our neighbour-state, has in one day been swept from the midst of Hellas." So far the note. This is *ἀναδίπλωσις*, *conduplicatio*, not an apostrophe, for Thebes is not addressed *in absentia*. The only likeness in the two passages is that both concern cities which had been destroyed. The passage on Catachresis (p. 343) would be illuminated by a note showing what the exact or precise words are which have been displaced by the "inexact." To note a on page 388 on propping the chin on the left hand as an indication of thought add a reference to Oedipus and the Sphinx on the red-figured cup in the style of Duris; reproduced in Rostovtzeff, *History of the Ancient World*, I, Pl. LXVII. Cf. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, p. 296, no. 12.

In connection with note d on page 42 which deals with the testamentary capacity of a man under sentence of death, it might be of some interest to know that at Athens this case was covered by statute. See the law quoted by Hyperides, *In Athenogenem*, 17: ἐξεῖν[αι τὰ ἐαυτοῦ [δια]τίθεσθαι ὅπως ἂν] τις βούληται, πλὴν [ἢ γή]ρωσ ἐνεκεν ἢ νόσου ἢ μανίῳν ἢ γυναικί] πειθόμε[νο]ν ἢ [ὑπὸ] δέσμοῦ ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνάγκης κ[ατ]αληφθ[έντ]α. Cf. Ps. Dem., XLI, 14.

We have waited for many years with keen expectation for the appearance of this book. The expectation has not been disappointed. This edition will long remain as the standard work in its field.

HARRY M. HUBBELL.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Menandri Quae Supersunt. Pars Altera: Reliquiae apud Veteres Scriptores Servatae. Edidit ALFREDUS KOERTE. Opus postumum retractavit, addenda ad utramque partem adiecit ANDREAS THIERFELDER. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1953. Pp. xii + 394. DM. 16.60.

The first part of this edition of Menander, containing parts of the text preserved in papyri and on parchment, appeared in 1938. It

included in addition such of the fragments from other sources as belong to the ten plays that appeared in it. Though neither volume has a table of contents, all known plays of Menander are listed alphabetically in the present volume with references to Volume I for the ten plays published there. There is also in this volume an index of titles of plays. Only *Perinthia* and *Misumenus* are divided between two volumes. Of the former a word from Harpocration is given as fragment 1a in Thierfelder's Addenda. Of the latter 26 broken lines from a papyrus published by Schubart in 1950 appear in the Addenda.

Since the last five of these are lines 1-5 of the previously known papyrus, an excellent test of the supplements suggested by scholars for those lines is provided. Wilamowitz hit the mark in lines 3 and 5, but no one was near in line 1. Lines 2 and 4 seem to require emendation. For line 2 I suggest ἀεί τε κάμπτεῖς and for line 4 δῆσαι κελεύσω τοῦτον, "I shall tell my master to ask him to dinner again and tie him up."

At the beginning of the Addenda are published 42 broken lines of a play that may well be Menander's, possibly the *Kekryphalus*. The situation is similar to that invented by Syrus at the end of Act 3 of Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos*. The sum that must be paid to Dorkion in the new play is the same; a thousand drachmas, as Syrus says, must be paid to Bacchis for release of Antiphila. The counterpart of Antiphila in the Greek play has a faithful servant Parmeno. Compare Parmeno in *Plokion* and Geta in the *Adelphoe* of Terence. A matron, perhaps corresponding to Sostrata in *Heauton*, gives Parmeno goods to secure his mistress' release. Moschion, who is in love with the girl, is permitted to enter the house of Dorkion with him and comfort his beloved. It is not impossible that we have here a scene from Menander's *Heauton*, for Terence in doubling the plot might well have presented as invention of Syrus what is presented in Menander as a real situation. At any rate the sum owed is the same.

Besides the 951 fragments, this volume contains Körte's preface, dated three years before his death in 1946. Thierfelder's preface is dated 1950. There is a postscript written in 1953 to inform the reader that only a few notes have been added since 1950. The book was actually ready to print in 1943 when the type was destroyed by bombing. The proofsheets survived, and after many delays Thierfelder has seen the book through the press. He has added many brief notes besides those in the Addenda, sometimes expressing disagreement with Körte. The Addenda to the first part include corrections, but nothing is said of δεισπότην, *Perinthia* 14, which stands in my copy. I note also that the reference to Dem. 3 is missing for *Theophrastumene*, fr. 7, on page 103. New supplements and interpretations are also cited, but in the report of Harsh's discussion of *Perik.* 171-8 Thierfelder has inadvertently written 'Sosia' for 'Davus.' It is Davus who cannot have entered from Myrrhina's house. See *A. J. P.*, LXII (1941), p. 104. So in reporting my supplements from *A. J. P.*, LXII, p. 466 he implies by his 'duce Allinsonio' that I was following Allinson. It would be true to say 'approbante Allinsonio.' No attempt has been made to bring the bibliography up to date in this volume, though there are scattered references to most articles on Menander. Great indebtedness to Webster

is acknowledged. Notably missing are any references to discussion of the supposed sculptured portrait of Menander later than the year 1935. Both Herbig and Carpenter assign the portrait to Vergil. The latter wrote most recently in *Hesperia*, XX (1951), pp. 34-44. But Miss Bieber strongly supports the claim of Menander in her book, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (Columbia Univ. Press, 1955).

The indexes are an immense boon to scholars. Plays known at least by title now number 99. Thierfelder rejects my *Hypergeros*, which was admittedly a long shot. See *T. A. P. A.*, LXXXI (1950), pp. 37-42. The index of gods, etc., might well have included the Phoenician Pataeci, to whom as saviour-gods there is an allusion in *Perik.* 230. The *index verborum* is accurate and usually distinguishes words not fully attested or cited only in the apparatus from those fully guaranteed. The Addenda seem to be disregarded in the Index. The form *λήξομον* (*sic*) is cited from fr. 649 with no warning, though it is clearly due to corruption and the verb is not attested for Menander. After the *index verborum* is a short index of odd forms, hiatus, metrical peculiarities, and so on. It would be convenient to have elision and crasis also included. Perhaps it is ungrateful to ask for more.

A table is provided for translating the numbering of fragments from Kock and Dem. to Körte. The old numbers are also cited in connection with each fragment. An asterisk after the number of a fragment seems to indicate that Körte had some doubts about the attribution of a fragment to a particular play, but I find no statement to this effect. The asterisk appears even when a fragment is found translated in a Roman comedy. In the case of *Ep.*, fr. 11, the fragment might as well belong to a number of other plays. Fr. 808 is represented by a blank space without explanation, while 686a and 686b have intruded. A. Dain proposes to add 871 *bis*. See *Bull. Assoc. Budé* for Sept., 1954, p. 169. Kock had 1130 fragments and Demiańczuk 25. The present volume has 951 for highest number. Numbers 932-50 are listed as doubtful, wrongly attributed, or spurious. Thierfelder helpfully gives in each case the reason why fragments formerly included do not appear here. Only a few new fragments were added by Körte. It was a great service when he discarded un-Menandrian material, particularly single lines from collections of maxims. Of course many fragments missing in this volume are found in the text of, or assigned to, the plays of Volume I.

Another valuable feature of this book is a collection of references to Menander in ancient writers or inscriptions. Some of Kock's fragments appear here as testimonies. On the other hand many testimonies are found in connection with fragments. It is too bad that room was not found for the comments of Aulus Gellius and Cicero on the difference between Greek and Latin comedy, as well as much matter from handbooks of rhetoric that is found in De Falco's school edition of the *Epitrepontes* (Naples, 1949). Körte's citations are, however, more conveniently arranged and include more evidence from inscriptions. I should like to see added to the testimonia Statius, *Silvae*, II, 1, 113-19, which proves that schoolboys spoke pieces from Menander as well as Homer, and Pliny, *N. H.*, XXX, 7: *literarum subtilitati sine aemulo genitus*. This indicates that Me-

nander's plain style was a strong point. The middle style of Terence, smooth and elegant, lacks power, as Caesar saw. I should paraphrase Pliny as saying that Menander was the unrivaled literary genius of the plain style. This quotation from Pliny does, however, appear in a citation under *Thettale*.

This is as good a place as any to mention some points that have occurred to me in going over the fragments. In fr. 47 (52 K) the participle of a verb of motion is needed since the subject came from a battle somewhere and corrupted all the women of Lamia. Read *πλεύσας* for *πλήσας*. For fr. 125 (138 K) I suggest *εὔρετικὸς οὖν κἀγὼ τι τὴν τούτου τέχνην*. In fr. 358 (425 K), line 2, *τοῦ* should be taken as the interrogative. Thus we get *ἐνεκα τοῦ ζῆν βούλεται / <διὰ τὸν τρόπον κακῶς>*, "what motive he has for wanting to live a poor life because he takes the course he does." In fr. 416 (481 K), line 11, the change of sigma to theta produces *ἀν πρῶτος ἀπίης καταλυθείς*, which presents no difficulty: "If you are dismissed and depart first," i. e., from the banquet of life. In fr. 816 (986 K) the superlative of a pronoun or proper name is cited from Menander, so that *αἰτιώτατος* will not do. The word is probably a corruption of *Ἀττικώτατος*, of which a form is actually used by Cicero. In fr. 951, line 11, it is clear that the speaker has used a term implying divine intervention. Read then *θεία τε* or *ὡς θεία*. In fr. 568 (541 K), line 8, *εἴσω δὲ* is almost certainly a misreading of *ἐκὼν* written in uncials. The sense is excellent, but a word must be supplied to fill the resulting gap. Perhaps the best is *δ' οὖν, γοῦν, or δῆθ'*; the latter I owe to the suggestion of a colleague, Mr. Arthur Brain. I suggest also *ῆ* for *ῆ* in the preceding line. Hence: *καιρὸς ἐστὶν ῆ νόσος / ψυχῆς. ὁ πλῆγεις δ' οὖν ἐκὼν τιτρώσκεται*. It is weakness of mind that admits love. "At any rate he who is smitten is glad of his wound."

The new fragment of the *Misumenus* presents an interesting problem, something like a Rorschach test, where each observer sees something different. For 1b-1d I suggest *δεινὸν γὰρ βίον / [τρυφῶν ἐβίουν] ἐγὼ [πρί]ν. οὐ γὰρ μακάριον / [ἐχρὴν λέγειν ἂ] συνέτον ὄνθ' οὕτω[ς τινά]*. Translate: "It was a terrible life that I lived when I had luxuries. For it would be wrong to call anyone fortunate who was so devoid of understanding." Then for 1r through 1 I get

ἄρ' οὗτός ἐστι δούλος οὐκλύω[ν κόρας;
ἡγείτο θ' αὐτῶν θάτερος [ὥστε λανθάνειν
τὸν ἄνδρα [πρὶν] ὁρᾶν, ὃ πολυτίμητοι θεοί,
σὸν πᾶσιν [ἀγαθοῖς.] τοῦτο δῆ[λον γὰρ ποεῖ.
πίνων δικαίως ἤσεν ἀνθρώ[ποις ἀπλοῖς
ἀγαθὸν ἄκουσμ'.

Translate: "Is this a slave who ransoms maidens? And one of the two went ahead so that the man was unseen until he had a good look, ye precious gods, with no hint of evil. For he makes that plain. He did his part honestly over the wine and sang a song that was good entertainment for simple people." I do not suppose of course that this is exactly what Menander wrote; yet it may convey some adumbration of the truth. There is more uncertainty about some letters than I have indicated in my text.

To return to business, the get up of this part seems equal in

every respect to that of the first. I noted one misprint—in the text of fr. 23 ἀνείδεια for ἀναίδεια. There are missing stops on pages 60 and 137, a reversed sigma below fr. 452, a few bad letters, and an omitted question mark after 718, line 6. There is a 't' missing from 'superabat,' page 5.

It is clear that we have here a greatly improved edition of the fragments of Menander, the fruit not only of arduous labor, but also of ripe scholarship and unusual acumen. No one but Körte could have produced it. We also owe a great debt to Thierfelder, who has rescued it from oblivion in the aftermath of war and presented it with valuable additions.

L. A. Post.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

ANDRÉ AYMARD and JEANNINE AUBOYER. Rome et son Empire. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1954. Pp. 783; 48 pls.; 31 figs.

This is the second volume of the new *Histoire Générale des Civilisations*. The book is large and outwardly impressive; at the end one lays it down with a distinct sense of disappointment.

The first six hundred pages are given over to Aymard's survey of Roman civilization. Factually the author makes remarkably few downright slips, and the proofreading has been excellent. At some points Aymard has incorporated quite recent findings; at other times his interpretations are those of a generation ago. The difficulty lies not in the details, which I shall not criticize here, but in the realm of general vigor and organization.

Aymard takes up first the civilizations of the Etruscans, Carthaginians, and Gauls. Roman civilization proper is divided into the three phases of Republic, Early Empire, and Late Empire. Each major phase begins with the general political climate, sketched very briefly with a minimum of dates and names; after the political introduction come in order chapters on political institutions, economic and social conditions, religion, and intellectual matters.

From the point of the student it may be observed that both the earlier peoples of Italy and the days of the Roman kingdom are almost ignored. Despite a lengthy Tableau Synchronique, covering pp. 708-42, a beginner in Roman history would probably find the background much too hazy; the chapters also tend to skip back and forth over two or more centuries in a fashion baffling to the neophyte.

Scholars can benefit from such a general survey only if it is richly documented or is infused with a brilliant, synoptic view. The plan of the present series forbids documentation, and one cannot properly quarrel with that decision; the bibliography is brief, though up-to-date, and is largely French.

What remains then? Simply a descriptive account of the surface of Roman civilization, which mentions the important thinkers and developments in dutiful fashion but goes no further. Aymard's style is rarely relieved either by the cutting generalization which abides in one's mind or by the skillful use of concrete fact to light up a complex situation; the reader is rarely challenged to halt and

the muse. Repeatedly the author comes up to great questions of Roman history such as the Roman expansion (pp. 87-90) or the decline and fall (pp. 596-9) and then slides away without presenting a fully rounded answer.

The present volume, moreover, is not just a survey of Roman development; it is presumably a study of a part of human civilization. As such it gives virtually no idea of the main currents stirring the Eurasian landmass during the epoch. In Aymard's part free Europe lies dark on the horizon; yet worse, the Parthian-Sasanid state, which was in many ways the center of the civilized world, nowhere receives any connected discussion.

Auboyer's part is a vestigial appendix. Less than one hundred pages in length, it treats of the civilizations of India, Southeast Asia, and China largely by piling up names and quotations in a mass of impressionistic prose. Central Asia is virtually ignored, though out of it the whirlwind was soon to strike both Europe and China.

The illustrations are numerous and are superbly reproduced; they are not tied to the text or otherwise discussed. The index is adequate.

CHESTER G. STARR.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

A. M. DALE. *The Plays of Euripides: Alcestis*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xl + 130. \$2.00 (12s. 6d.).

This is the latest addition to the Oxford series of annotated editions of the plays of Euripides, a series which has already proved its value to students of Greek everywhere. As users of previous volumes will recall, the text of Gilbert Murray (OCT, 1902) is reproduced *verbatim*; where the editor differs from Professor Murray, the reading preferred by the editor will be found in the commentary. Although this practice may confuse the student at first (since most American students will assume that the text as printed is the only text), the saving in printing-costs more than justifies the method. At any rate, in this edition of the *Alcestis*, Miss Dale rarely disagrees with Murray—perhaps a dozen times in all.

Miss Dale states that in preparing the Commentary she kept the undergraduate mostly in mind, although she hopes that "the Sixth Form may find things in it to interest them." For my part, I found the notes none too easy for an imaginary, but typical graduate student. At first sight this fact would merely seem to indicate the difference between Greek studies in England and America; but on further examination much of the difficulty appears to lie in the nature of the notes themselves. A great deal of space is devoted to purely textual matters, and very often the discussion makes the interpretation of the Greek more difficult and complicated than it really is. For most American students the purpose of notes is to elucidate, not to complicate the interpretation and meaning of the text; and few of our undergraduates are interested in or concerned

with long defences of the received text against various "improvements" made by nineteenth-century editors.

A detailed and "meaty" Introduction includes discussions of the tetralogy of which the *Alcestis* formed a part, the Alcestis-legend as a whole, the play itself, and the history of the text. Most readers will be primarily interested in Miss Dale's remarks on Euripides' treatment of the material and on his attitude toward the characters and the action of the drama. In Part III ("The *Alcestis* as a pro-satyrical play") Miss Dale reaches the conclusion that although the play contains recognizably pro-satyrical, or lighter elements, this fact does not modify its dramatic essence: "the action . . . is meant, together with all the characters, to be taken seriously." With this as a premise, she submits "The Characters and the Action" (Part IV) to a brief, but (in my opinion) brilliant analysis. As for the action, she finds the central theme of the tragedy in the experience of Admetus, who learns too late that the life of which he has cheated Destiny is a useless possession. This is perhaps a conventional, or at least widely-accepted view; but for those who seek the essence of Euripidean tragedy in complex character-portrayal, Miss Dale offers a surprising and novel approach in her discussion of the characters. It is perhaps fairest to state her main point in her own words: "The root of the trouble" (*viz.*, in past interpretations of the characters of Alcestis and Admetus) "lies in our inveterate modern habit of regarding a drama almost exclusively in terms of its characters. The modern conception of the actor's function, with each actor concentrating on the 'interpretation' of his single part, strongly reinforces this habit. It works quite well with modern drama, which is largely composed from the same point of view. It can be made to work with Shakespeare. But it will not work satisfactorily with Greek tragedy. Of course, the Greek, like every serious drama, involves 'characters,' whose part in the action, and therefore whose words, to some extent reflect their several natures. But in Greek tragedy, their speeches . . . can rarely be interpreted as *primarily* or *consistently* expressive of their natures, and whenever we find ourselves trying to build up some elaborate or many-sided personality by *adding up* small touches gleaned from all parts of the play we can be pretty sure of being on the wrong lines." From this point of view, much of the accepted analysis of character in the *Alcestis* is faulty, especially the traditional view of the play as a realistic and elaborately unflattering character-study of Admetus as a vain and selfish egotist. In Miss Dale's opinion, Admetus is a person to whom things happen; "it is his experience that matters," not his character. "So far from considering the *Alcestis* as a full-length study of *naïveté*, weakness, . . . and so forth, I do not believe that Euripides had any particular interest in what sort of person Admetus was." The conclusion is that we must pay more attention to "the rhetoric of the situation" in interpreting Euripides. "Nourished on the psychological novel, we tend to assume that the poet had brooded on the story until the characters took shape in his mind, as if he had asked himself: What would X, being such a man, be likely to say in such a situation? whereas we might sometimes get nearer to the meaning by imagining the question: Suppose a man involved in such a situation, how should he best acquit himself? How gain his point? Move his hearers? Prove his thesis? Convey

information lucidly and vividly?" Your reviewer, who spends a good deal of his time teaching Greek drama to undergraduates, finds this a valuable warning and a stimulating point of view which should be taken into account in interpreting ancient drama to modern students.

To sum up: this is a useful, indeed most valuable edition. All teachers of the *Alcestis* will want to consult it, whether they can use it in class or not. As for its use by students, I imagine that a graduate student would feel more at home in the commentary, but a reasonably advanced and ambitious undergraduate Greek major will find much to arouse his interest and lead him to some conception of the higher levels of scholarship in the treatment of classical texts.

CHARLES T. MURPHY.

OBERLIN COLLEGE.

MYRA L. UHLFELDER. *De Proprietate Sermonum vel Rerum. A Study and Critical Edition of a Set of Verbal Distinctions.* Rome, American Academy in Rome, 1954. Pp. 115. (*Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*, XV.)

In an age in which looseness of language is dismayingly prevalent it is pleasant to scan a work written with the sole and specific purpose of encouraging precision in the use of synonymous words. The author of the *De Proprietate Sermonum vel Rerum* was following a tradition which began for the Latin language as early as Cato, was continued through the Republic and the Empire, and came into special prominence when actual sets of these verbal distinctions were compiled as a refinement of grammar. The earliest datable set was made in the fourth century. It had its counterpart a millennium and more later, when a European schoolbook could present the compounds of the verb *sedeo* in hexameter verse duly calculated to fix their differences in the student's mind: "Hostibus insideo, medicus pius assidet egro,/ Subsident hic patrie, sed presidet ille Velitris,/ Obsidet hic muros, podio sed considet iste,/ Desidet ille piger, discordans dissidet ille,/ Insidet hic asino, magnam rex obsidet urbem."

The set here edited was compiled probably in the fourth century and contains with much likelihood material transmitted by Flavius Capser from the Republican period. The editor deduces that it preserves remnants of the lost works of Verrius Flaccus and of Pliny. Its 256 distinctions present in nutshell form, ordinarily in a single sentence, the broad and also the finer differences between such words as *diutinus* and *diuturnus*, *fidus* and *fidelis*, *germanus* and *frater*, *nasci* and *enasci*, *omnis* and *totus*, *percussus* and *perculsus*, *rogus* and *pyra*. Although no index to the words is provided it is readily clear that the distinctions were of great assistance in their day to students of the Latin language; a close perusal of them would in fact be beneficial to most teachers of Latin today and at the same time, because of the succinct and refreshing style in which they are written, enjoyable. "A word to the wise. . ."

The last edition of this set was published in 1803 and reprinted

in 1862; it had been based on a much-criticized edition of 1601. The present edition, done according to the highest standards of modern scholarship, is an enormous advance. It is provided with an introduction which traces the history of verbal distinctions in general and of this set in particular and includes a conspectus of the manuscripts; with a full critical apparatus and citations of *testimonia*; with a table setting forth the order in which the *differentiae* occur in the various manuscripts; and with an appendix on the *differentiae* of the *Liber Glossarum*. For such complicated material the format and typography are excellent, and the Italian printer is to be congratulated. Nor is it his fault that there exists no international syllabication and that he has sometimes treated English at the end of a line as if it were Italian; he could point out in turn that American printers continue obstinately to spell *Giuseppe* with the *i* and *u* in reverse order. Also to be congratulated are the American Academy in Rome for this worthy addition to its series of Papers and Monographs, the editor herself for her painstaking and rewarding labors, and the mentors who counseled her in her task. Similar editions are needed for many authors. If American publishers cannot undertake them, scholars will do well to investigate the possibilities of publication abroad.

DOROTHY M. SCHULLIAN.

ARMED FORCES MEDICAL LIBRARY.

-
- L. CAES and R. HENRION. *Collectio Bibliographica Operum ad Ius Romanum Pertinentium: Series Prima, Opera in periodicis miscellaneis encyclopaediisque edita*, vols. 1, 2-3, 4-5. Brussels, Office International de Librairie, 1949-53. Pp. 448; 944; 949. Series Secunda, *Theses*, vol. 1: *Theses Galliae*. 1950. Pp. 448.

All books and articles concerning Roman public and private law which have appeared since 1800 are being efficiently indexed by professors of Roman Law at Louvain and Liège. The enterprise has received a hearty reception from the jurists for its completeness and accuracy. The reviewer has tested in a few places the coverage of archaeological and philological periodicals and would support the endorsement given by the jurists. But historians and philologists will greet with special satisfaction the guidance into the recesses of juristic periodicals, because the problems of Roman law are also problems of Roman history and many even are problems which arise again and again in the study of Latin literature.

The third series will contain *opera praeter theses separatim vel etiam coniunctim edita*. The whole series (those so far published can be acquired for \$65) will be necessary at least for a full exploitation of our system of interlibrary loans.

J. H. OLIVER.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all pertaining to the classical field are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Adcock (F. E.). *Caesar as Man of Letters*. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1956. Pp. ix + 114. \$2.00.

Austin (R. G.). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Edited with a Commentary. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1955. Pp. xx + 212. \$2.40.

Bailey (D. R. Shackleton). *Propertiana*. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1956. Pp. xii + 326. \$6.50. (*Cambridge Classical Studies*.)

Barigazzi (Adelmo). Antifonte, Prima orazione con introduzione e note. Firenze, *Felice Le Monnier*, 1955. Pp. 101.

Barigazzi (Adelmo). Antifonte, Sesta orazione con introduzione e note. Firenze, *Felice Le Monnier*, 1955. Pp. 122.

Bauer (Walter). *Zur Einführung in das Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*; København, *Ejnar Munksgaard*, 1955. Pp. 30. (*Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, XV.)

Bennett (Emmett L., Jr.). *The Pylos Tablets. Texts of the Inscriptions Found 1939-1954*. With a Foreword by Carl W. Blegen. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press for the Univ. of Cincinnati*, 1955. Pp. xxxii + 252. \$5.00.

Biehl (Werner). *Textprobleme in Euripides Orestes. Interpolationen u. a.* Göttingen, *Hubert & Co.*, 1955. Pp. 99. (Inaugural Diss.)

Briessmann (Adalbert). *Tacitus und das Flavische Geschichtsbild*. Wiesbaden, *Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH*, 1955. Pp. 105. (*Hermes, Einzelschriften*, Heft 10.)

Brugnoli (Giorgio). *Studi sulle differentiae verborum*. Rome, *Angelo Signorelli*, 1955. Pp. 383. (*Studi e Saggi*.)

Clarke (M. L.). *The Roman Mind. Studies in the History of Thought from Cicero to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1956. Pp. vii + 168. \$3.75.

Copley (Frank O.). *Plautus, The Haunted House (Mostellaria)*. Translated with an Introduction. New York, *The Liberal Arts Press*, 1955. \$0.45. (*The Library of Liberal Arts*, No. 42.)

Cormack (J. M. R.). *Notes on the History of the Inscribed Monuments of Aphrodisias*. *University of Reading*, 1955. Pp. 66.

Crawford (D. S.). *Papyri Michaelidae. Being a Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri, Tablets and Ostraca in the Library of Mr. G. A. Michailidis of Cairo*. Edited with Translations and Notes. *Aberdeen Univ. Press for the Egypt Exploration Society*, 1955. Pp. xiv + 168; 4 pls. 52s. 6d.

Crusius (Friedrich). *Römische Metrik. Eine Einführung*. 2. Auflage. München, *Max Hueber Verlag*, 1955. Pp. 148.

DeLorenzi (Attilio). *Fedro*. Firenze, "*La Nuova Italia*," 1955. Pp. 214. (*Biblioteca di Cultura*, 56.)

Des Places (Édouard, S. J.). *Diadoque de Photicé, Oeuvres spirituelles*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Paris, *Les Éditions du Cerf*, 1955. Pp. 206. (*Sources Chrétiennes*, No. 5 bis.)

Desrousseaux (A. M.). *Athénée de Naucratis, Les Deipnosophistes, Livres I et II*. Texte établi et traduit, avec le concours de Charles Astruc. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres"*, 1956. Pp. lxxiii + 207.

Finley (J. H., Jr.). *Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1955. Pp. 307. \$4.50. (*Martin Classical Lectures*, XIV.)

Fränkel (Hermann). Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens. Literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien. Herausgegeben von Franz Tietze. München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955. Pp. xx + 316.

Giomini (Remo). Saggio sulla "Fedra" di Seneca. Rome, Angelo Signorelli, 1955. Pp. 123. (*Studi e Saggi*.)

Godel (Roger). Platon à Héliopolis d'Égypte. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1956. Pp. 83.

Grene (David) and Lattimore (Richmond). Euripides II. "The Cyclops" and "Heracles" trans. by W. Arrowsmith; "Iphigenia in Tauris" trans. by W. Bynner; "Helen" trans. by R. Lattimore. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1956. Pp. v + 263. \$3.75.

Hackforth (R.). Plato's Phaedo. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. Cambridge, University Press, 1955. Pp. vii + 200. \$4.00.

Hadas (Moses). Seneca's Oedipus. Translated with an Introduction. New York, The Liberal Arts Press, 1955. Pp. 38. (*The Library of Liberal Arts*, No. 44.)

Hemmerdinger (Bertrand). Essai sur l'histoire du texte de Thucydide. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1955. Pp. 74. (*Budé*.)

Herrington (C. J.). Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias. A Study in the Religion of Periclean Athens. Manchester, University Press, 1955. Pp. 70; plan of Acropolis. 10s. 6d.

Hovingh (Pieter Frans). Claudius Marius Victorius, Alethia. La prière et les vers 1-170 du livre I avec introduction, traduction et commentaire. Groningen, Djakarta, J. B. Wolters, 1955. Pp. 131.

Iannone (Antonio). I logoi essoterici di Aristotele. Venezia, Officine Grafiche Carlo Ferrari, 1955. Pp. 31. (Estratto dagli *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, CXIII [1954-55].)

Jóhannesson (Alexander). Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Sechste und siebte Lieferung. Bern, A. Francke AG. Verlag, 1955. Pp. 801-1120.

Josephson (Åke). Die Columella-Handschriften. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955. Pp. 181; 4 pls. (*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift*, 8.)

Kenner (Hedwig). Das Theater und der Realismus in der griechischen Kunst. Wien, Verlag A. Seel, 1955. Pp. 197; 30 pls.

Knauer (Georg Nicolaus). Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955. Pp. 215.

Kristeller (Paul Oskar). The Classics and Renaissance Thought. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1955. Pp. 106. \$2.50. (*Martin Classical Lectures*, XV.)

Kühn (Josef-Hans). System- und Methodenprobleme im Corpus Hippocraticum. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1956. Pp. 106. (*Hermes, Einzelschriften*, Heft 11.)

Lévêque (Pierre). Agathon. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1956. Pp. 176. (*Annales de l'Université de Lyon*, troisième série: *Lettres*, fasc. 26.)

Lewis (Martha W. Hoffman). The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians. A Study of the Nobility from 44 B. C. to 68 A. D. Rome, American Academy, 1955. Pp. 186. (*Papers and Monographs*, XVI.)

Linforth (Ivan M.). Philoctetes, the Play and the Man. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1956. (*Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Philology*, XV, 3, pp. 95-156.)

Lundström (Vilhelmus) and Josephson (Åke). L. Iuni Moderati Columellae Opera Quae Extant, Fasc. Quintus Rei Rusticae Libros Octavum et Nonum Continens. Uppsala, Eranos' Förlag, 1955. Pp. xix + 117. (*Collectio Scriptorum Veterum Upsaliensis*.)

Maniet (A.). L'évolution phonétique et les sons du latin ancien dans le cadre des langues indo-européennes. 2ème édition (entièrement refondue et considérablement augmentée). Louvain, Éditions E. Nauwelaerts; Paris, Beatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1955. Pp. 210.